



THE
CHURCH

AND
THE

BOMB

WH

200

WAR

CHU

THE GENERAL SYNOD DEBATE

CHURCH AND THE BOMB

WESTCOTT HOUSE
CAMBRIDGE

The Chase Library

17247

200

WAR

CHU

THE CHURCH AND THE BOMB

The General Synod Debate, February 1983

WESTCOTT HOUSE
THE CHASE
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE

200 WAR CHU



8E984

088 568 369

C I O PUBLISHING,
Church House, Dean's Yard, London SW1P 3NZ

Published for the General Synod by C I O Publishing

© *The Central Board of Finance of the Church of England 1983*

This publication may not be reproduced either in whole or in part whether for sale or otherwise by any method without written permission which should be sought from the Legal Adviser to the General Synod, Church House, Dean's Yard, London SW1P 3NZ

PRINTED IN ENGLAND BY

THE
PRINT
BUSINESS
LTD

THE DEBATE

The Chairman: Before we begin our debate, may I say something about its content and its shape. First, we are debating two documents, the paper-backed report *The Church and the Bomb*, produced by the Bishop of Salisbury's Working Party, and the report GS 542, with the same title, produced by the Board for Social Responsibility, in which the Board comments on the paper-back. As members of the Synod know, it is strictly the Board's report which is before us, with the paper-back as an appendix to it, but it is, of course, open to members to refer to both documents in our debate. For clarity's sake, it might be helpful if speakers referred to the Board or the Working Party.

Secondly, about the form of the debate, we have before us three main motions. The first motion, 'That this Report be received', will provide us with an opportunity for a general reflection on the contents of the two reports. Members should seek to intervene in the debate on that motion, No 14, if they have things to say to us which are general in character, for example, general reflections on the theology and morality of the possession and use of nuclear weapons and on the theory of deterrence. I suggest that we might hope to move on from that motion not much later than 11.15.

The second motion, No 15, when we reach it, will get us to the heart of our business today. In that motion the Bishop of London, on behalf of the Board for Social Responsibility, will be inviting the Synod to urge the Government and its NATO allies to reduce progressively their dependence on nuclear weapons and to seek to strengthen international treaties relating to the possession and control of nuclear weapons.

We then have a large number of amendments set out on the Thirteenth Notice Paper. Those who were in the Synod last night will have heard me say that I do not believe it would be helpful to a clear debate for the Synod to have to vote through some 20 amendments. Those who have amendments to motions have a right to move them. I hope that some of them may consider not moving them when the time comes. Indeed, I am grateful that some have already withdrawn their amendments. Those who put down amendments to amendments have to receive the Chairman's permission to move them. As I said last night, in the interests of a less interrupted debate on the great interests in front of us, I have decided not to give my permission. That relates to all those amendments printed within square brackets on the Notice Paper. In addition, may I refer to

the first amendment on the Thirteenth Notice Paper in the name of Mr Bulmer-Thomas. I rule that this amendment is not relevant to the motion.

Two major amendments that we shall be debating on motion 15 stand in the names of the Bishop of Salisbury and the Bishop of Birmingham. When we come to that motion, I hope to call them at a fairly early time in the debate, though not necessarily immediately after the Bishop of London, nor immediately one after the other. When they do speak, I am prepared to allow them exceptionally up to 20 minutes, although I hope they will stay nearer to 15 minutes. I will treat the time-limit with similar flexibility when the Bishop of London makes his second speech on motion 15. For the rest I will want to hold strictly to the normal time-limits on speeches. Then, when we come to motion 15, I will ask the Bishops of Salisbury and Birmingham not to move their amendments immediately after they have spoken. This afternoon, when the time seems ripe, I will ask them to move their amendments formally.

Finally, we shall come this afternoon to motion 16, which is designed to commend the subject for further discussion in the dioceses.

The Bishop of London (Rt Rev. G.D. Leonard): I beg to move:

‘That this Report be received.’

In moving this motion ‘That the Report be received’, I shall be following your advice, Mr Chairman, and not using the word ‘report’ but referring to the Board or the Working Party.

There is no need, I hope, for me to stress the gravity of the issues at stake. I would, however, want to emphasise that we are considering them as a Christian body. The religious and moral aspects should predominate. In 1979, when resolving that there should be further consideration of the matter, the Synod specifically asked for the theological issues to be explored. As a Christian body, it is also our responsibility to give an example of how such a debate can take place with charity, on the one hand, and with honesty and integrity, on the other. We shall serve no one today if issues are fudged or we fail to listen to what others are saying. As I said in a lecture in St Lawrence Jewry, ‘It is not conducive to that clear thinking which is essential, nor is it of ultimate benefit to mankind, to polarise the issue and see it as a conflict between war-mongers on the one hand and peace makers on the other — between ‘Hawks’ and ‘Doves’. Though we differ as to how it is to be achieved, we must accept that we all desire the best for

mankind, just as we must accept that we are all appalled at the horrifying prospect of nuclear war.'

In moving the present motion, I do not propose saying anything about recommendations 18-22 of the Working Party which advocate the unilateral renunciation of nuclear weapons by the United Kingdom. I shall do so when speaking in the context of the next motion.

What I shall try to do in this speech is first to spell out the fundamental religious and moral issues at stake. When the Christian speaks of man being made in the image of God, he is asserting first that man has a moral capacity for distinguishing between good and evil, a capacity which he cannot abdicate. Secondly, he has a capacity for exploring and manipulating the physical world of which he is part. This he should do in a way which is controlled by his moral nature so that it is used for good and for the glory of God. Thirdly, it means that he is made for eternal fellowship with the living God, the Holy and True, for which life in this world is a preparation.

Trying to live as one made in that image, he finds himself in a world in which the technical ingenuity of man has given him virtually boundless destructive force. He also finds himself in a world in which not only is man aggressive and selfish but a world in which nations can embrace and pursue policies which are evil. Even at the personal level, love has to be based on justice, and restraint — with the sanction of force — has to be exercised if evil is to be recognised and dealt with and if the innocent are not to be allowed to suffer. The agonising dilemma of man today is that he is faced with the fact that the ultimate sanction for the enforcement of justice and the resistance of evil is of such a nature that it seems intolerable to contemplate its use. How in such a situation does he act if he is to be true to his moral nature? Can he urge his Government to pursue a policy which allows evil to flourish?

In the face of this dilemma, there are ultimately two alternatives. One is the way of renunciation. This is the way of the pacifist who endures whatever befalls him rather than use force, believing that the use of force is the greatest evil. While this way may be morally right for an individual, it is difficult to see how it can be rightly advocated as a policy for a nation, for it demands that others who do not share that conviction should suffer or, if need be, die. Secondly, it requires that nuclear weapons, which the pacifist regards as inherently evil, should be allowed to rest solely in the hands of those who have no scruples about their use either in war or as blackmail. Thirdly, it does not necessarily bring peace except in the narrow sense of absence of conflict between two sides, since

one side alone is prepared to fight. For this reason, I think 'pacifism' would more accurately be described as 'non-resistance to evil by physical means'. The Working Party says rightly on page 114 that, 'Without . . . justice there can be no peace as there is no peace when nations are subjugated to totalitarian regimes and order is achieved at the cost of the denial of human freedom'.

The alternative way is that of deterrence. In general terms, this means making clear that certain consequences will follow if a person, group or nation behaves in a particular way, with the intention that it will deter them from doing so. In the context of war and peace, deterrence is intended to prevent war, not to wage it. Christians have always recognised that deterrence needs to be controlled on moral grounds. Hence, for example, the restrictions on the way a police force operates, and the doctrine of the Just War which sought to regulate military action. It may be argued that deterrence requires the innocent to suffer and is therefore open to the same objection as pacifism, but whereas the intention of deterrence is that such suffering should be prevented, it is of the essence of pacifism that it should be accepted.

All Christians are agreed on the urgent need to negotiate for disarmament, and to continue in the face of slow progress or frustrating setbacks. An effective policy of deterrence does not demand the present level of nuclear weapons and is compatible with pressure for disarmament. Indeed it may demand it since deterrence serves as an incentive to negotiate, whereas a capacity for overkill on one side or the other removes it.

What guidance does the Working Party give in deciding between these alternatives? It is to this decision that I direct the Synod's attention at this stage of the debate, for we cannot talk about ways of preserving justice, freedom and peace if renunciation is the only morally acceptable way and deterrence is to be ruled out. As is clear from GS 542, the response of the Board to the Working Party was varied, and individual members will be free today to put their own views, but I think that I speak for most, if not all, members when I say that It felt that it blurred the choice rather than clarified it. Let me give some examples.

First, the Working Party is confused on the question of deterrence. On page 98 it is roundly condemned: 'The ethics of deterrence are the ethics of threatening to do something which one believes to be immoral, which one intends to do only in circumstances which will not arise because of the conditional threat'. Yet on page 163 it welcomes the deterrent effect of the continued effect of the bomb even if it were locked up. Further,

on page 65, it quotes with approval Prof. Michael Howard's statement that 'to concern oneself in ethical values to the total exclusion of any practical activity in the dimension of power is to abdicate responsibility for shaping affairs'. Yet the principle of deterrence is an essential element in the control of power.

Secondly, the pages 111-117 on peace, love and justice hang in mid-air. The Working Party says that: 'It is in the social order that justice finds its full relevance. While love between persons is the end, justice, mediated by impersonal institutions, conventions, laws and norms, is the necessary means'. But these things rely on sanctions and deterrence in a fallen world. There is little consideration of how power is to be used in the pursuit of justice, particularly if the ultimate sanction is to be put in the hands of those who do not have justice in their vocabulary.

Thirdly, the doctrine of the Just War is examined in the form which it developed in the days of conventional weapons. No consideration is given as to how far the principles which it sought to embody could and should be re-expressed in the light of modern weapons, biological and chemical as well as nuclear.

Fourthly, the Working Party blurs the distinction between good and evil. This is particularly evident in its attempt to deal even-handedly with the West and with Soviet Russia. I must make it clear that I am not talking about the American, European or Russian peoples, and suggesting that we in the West are all good and they are all bad. I am talking about declared policies of Governments. We must not suppose that because we are all imperfect and sinful, every political standpoint is as good or as bad as another. Watergate, a scandal in a political democracy, which led to the downfall of a President, is not the same as Auschwitz, the horror of a deliberate policy of extermination. The Working Party says, on page 162, that some may feel that 'we have based our recommendations on a disputable and far too optimistic assessment of Soviet intentions'. It then simply says, 'This is not so', but in fact many believe that it has. It goes on to say that even if it has not, it would have made no difference, but gives no evidence for its judgement.

The fact is that the basic position of Marxist-Leninism expressed in Lenin's remark that peace as an ultimate objective simply means Communist world domination has not changed, though it is assumed that the Soviet leaders would prefer their expansionist aims to be achieved without the necessity of war. Hence the extent of what are known as Soviet active measures to infiltrate the West. We must not blind ourselves to the fact that Leninist control means the repudiation of natural

as well as Christian morality. It means that the State, not God, determines what is right and wrong. It means the suppression of those who dissent, and psychiatric prisons to correct their deviant views. As the Board says on page 14 of GS 542, 'Is there any longer a sharp distinction between right and wrong? And if there is, how is the evil of a totalitarian tyranny, with suppression of human rights, a tight State control over the means of government, communication and production, and an avowed expansionist intention, to be measured against the appalling destructive power of modern nuclear warfare, to say nothing of its entail on posterity or the environmental damage it would cause?' It is no answer to that crucial question to minimise the difference between good and evil.

I think the main reason why the Working Party does not give us the guidance we need is because it elevates its opinion that the possession and use of nuclear weapons is morally wrong to such a position as to override all other moral considerations. As a result, it is unclear and confused about the other demands such as those of justice and how they are to be witnessed to and maintained in a fallen world.

Our present situation is a judgment upon us all, as individuals, and as nations, demonstrating our rejection of the divine pattern for human life. Our response to that judgment must be a recovery of our moral sense. But this must begin with repentance in every aspect of life, not simply with the repudiation of one result of our sinful condition. We must not allow the results of man's inventiveness and destructiveness to overrule our moral responsibility.

The Board, on pages 11-12, draws attention to the neglect of the apocalyptic tradition in both Old and New Testaments by the Working Party; I could have wished that we had all read the Book of Revelation before this debate, for it concentrates the mind wonderfully. Prof. Ulrich Simon, whose father was murdered by the Nazis and whose brother perished in the Soviet Union in the great purges, having reflected on what Scripture says about glory and honour and truth, says, 'Without these universals human life is not worth preserving. It may be that we have reached this pass which necessitates the End. Who,' he says, 'can pretend that the human race has not already polluted the earth beyond recovery. . . . The delusion of pleasure binds the consumer society and entices the socialist world. Envy reigns. The report does not minimise our sinfulness but it cannot envisage Samson at Gaza. A Milton would have redressed the balance here.'

In the Book of Revelation the vision and promise of the eternal peace, in which creation is redeemed and consecrated in Christ, is interwoven with

the vision of the defeat of evil portrayed in all its horror and with which there can be no compromise. The victory of Christ, the Lamb that was slain, has to be implemented to the full before the End of the Ages when the peoples will dwell in peace in the City of God.

What does this say to us in our dilemma? I can, like the prophet, only speak as a child stammering for words. We must not simply wait passively for Armageddon. Nor must we seek a peace which is no peace, in which evil could prevail unchallenged and unchecked. I can understand a humanist speaking for a brief respite at whatever cost but as Christians I believe that we can only ask for and work for that fragile peace which is all our sinfulness allows, that peace which deterrence gives, which recognises evil and seeks to check it while we repent and call upon others to do the same in the hope that the Lord will give us what is better.

The Dean of Durham (Very Rev. P.R. Baelz): I am dismayed at my temerity in venturing to make a maiden speech on this occasion, not only because of the seriousness of the topic, but also because I do so in the presence of my former sixth form master, then Mr, now Sir James, Cobban, and I remember his brooding over my written efforts before coming to the regular conclusion that it was not up to standard. More seriously, I hesitate to speak because I am deeply divided in myself, but perhaps I may take comfort from Dr Arabin who, going from Oxford University to become Dean of Barchester, was said, on television, to have confided to Mrs Bold, his betrothed, 'I find it possible to hold diametrically opposite views at one and the same time'. I hope members will realise that I am deeply serious, although not always deeply solemn.

My divisions within myself are threefold. First, I stand very close to a Christian pacifist position, having in the last war been a conscientious objector and never having quite broken with that tradition. I note it was said that it is morally right perhaps for individuals to be pacifists. All I would want to say at this point is that I see it as a vocation rather than as a political policy, and I see it also as exercising a kind of warning against such remarks as Samson pulling down the world with him and an appeal to Armageddon; but with my Christian pacifism I am inclined to believe both that the use of nuclear weapons, except perhaps on small tactical occasions — and the possibility of escalation seems to me so great that I do not wish to draw a clear distinction between tactical and strategic weapons — would be morally wrong, they would serve no clear political or human good, and also that the threat of the use of nuclear weapons, though morally justifiable, as I shall attempt to show in a moment, is also morally corrupting and must, as soon as man can, be

abjured. But, lastly, I believe that in the present situation it is right for the West to retain a nuclear deterrent.

The Synod can see how confused I am. Let me say that the confusion arises, I think, between keeping distinct, though I hope allowing to interpenetrate, the theological considerations, the ethical and the political. There is no straight deductive course from one to the other. You cannot argue straight from your theology to your ethics, nor straight from your ethics to your politics.

May I, before attempting to explain the position I hold and justifying it, say that I am glad that the report came out when it did. I am glad that it argued in the way it did so that we should consider its arguments very closely. I am sorry that in certain sections of the press the authors have been belittled and also sorry that this Synod has been belittled. This Synod is certainly not a political party, nor is it the House of Commons, but nevertheless it is right, at least for educational — if you like — purposes (and I take education in the widest sense), that we should discuss this issue as dispassionately as possible, though no doubt with passion in our heart.

The pacifist vocation first, briefly, seems to me to be a willingness to respond to the way of Our Lord whatever the consequences and not to believe that it is a duty for the Christian Church to manage the affairs of the world. It is in that sense sectarian, it is in that sense appropriate, I think, that the early Church was almost consistently pacifist, but it does not follow that, if Christians believe they should be concerned with the management of the affairs of the world, the pacifist course is one that they can commend to their fellows.

So we come to the Just War tradition. Just War means that in some instances war, however abhorrent to the spirit of Jesus Christ, may be justified, but justified not simply in defence of the safety of the people — *Salus populi suprema lex est*, I remember from my school days — but in the pursuit of justice, and if war is to be used in the pursuit of justice, then there must be limitations both on its use and on its conduct. It is interesting that Augustine, in developing this tradition from secular and Christian sources, did not concern himself particularly with the problem of discrimination between the guilty and the innocent. He was more concerned with other evils that he saw were involved. But the principle of discrimination was applied in order to limit the direction which war might take in order that an injustice should not be done in order to achieve justice, because what is the point of fighting in the name of justice if at the same time you are acting unjustly? So it was that

through that principle and also the principle of proportion — that the good to be achieved must outweigh the evil means to be used — through these two principles, the war of defence, the war justified in the name of justice, was something which was admitted into the Christian tradition.

But today the use of nuclear weapons seems to offend those criteria. They seem to be indiscriminate and probably not achieving a relative proportional amount of good, and so in the name of justice the use of nuclear weapons is to be proscribed.

But what about the threat? — and here I think we have to see that philosophical and ethical theories divide. One type of theory will say that an act, if it is immoral in itself, cannot be done, however moral and just the motive with which it is done; but another tradition will place an act within the consequences and judge the ethics or morality of that act in terms not only of the act itself but also of the consequences to be achieved by that act. It is this difference of theory that underlies a difference of moral judgment about whether or not the threat of nuclear weapons is one that is morally justifiable. I believe myself that if we look to consequences the threat is justifiable, but not every threat of something disproportionate is necessarily a disproportionate threat. So long as we keep the threat to the minimum that we can keep it to, then we can take into account that end, namely, the preservation of peace, which the threat is intended to secure. It becomes then justifiable to do something which is unjust.

May I add that from a Christian point of view, deterrence is not enough; that we need other things than policies of containment to find a Christian answer.

Mrs H. Flint (Southwark): In considering this problem, the Church and the Bomb, I wondered where on earth to start. Would I start with the immensity of power that nuclear weapons present us with, or would I start with the human misery which these weapons cause? For me too much has been said about the power because this leads to fear, and for me fear is a bad guide. To think of the misery of the results of the bomb, I turn to those who know, the victims of Hiroshima.

My daughter has married a Japanese, my grandson is half-Japanese, and I identify very strongly with the victims of Hiroshima. When I visited Japan about 18 months ago, I was unable, I did not wish, to visit Hiroshima. I think I had a feeling of guilt, of shame and of horror, and I could not face that memorial. However, when this debate was coming I asked my daughter to send me something which would make me able to

speak of my feelings, and she sent me a little book, 'Notes on Hiroshima' by Kenzaburo Oe, written in 1963/64, notes which remembered the horror and the misery of the people who suffered the effects of the bomb. And is this not where we should all start?

The evil is immense, but it is crystallised, as we have seen evil crystallised before, in the sufferings of one person, one people, a small group of people, and in that suffering I believe we must identify the suffering of a mother who loses her family, who is herself condemned to a lingering death which she cannot escape, the suffering of a mother who chooses to die with her child and urges others to escape from a death which they know will come upon them, the courage of the doctors who, themselves irradiated, go back into Hiroshima and serve the people who are dying, the courage of the people who survive and for years afterwards have either fought for peace or have hidden themselves in shame because they cannot bring their scars to the eyes of the world — the 'atom bomb maidens' who hid in the backrooms of their houses.

I believe that in Japan, in the sufferings of the victims of Hiroshima, we have an example of redemptive power to deal with suffering. I believe that by studying and meditating with the victims we can see that there is power in the human character to overcome suffering. I do not believe this is just in people, but I believe that the Japanese nation has made the right decision to renounce the cause of the suffering, to renounce the power which they could if they wished develop. They are a powerful nation, and they chose to renounce nuclear power.

I believe that this is baptismal language. I believe that we are called upon to share in a baptism of suffering, not just as Christians with the baptism of Calvary, but in the baptism of suffering through the world. I believe that the victims of Hiroshima and the survivors have shown us how to integrate suffering and not run away from it, how to accept it in a way that can lead to renunciation, because you cannot renounce that with which you have not identified.

The language of baptism, it seems to me, is about death, the death of something that you know and identify with, and because of this I welcome the Working Party's report, because I am able here to identify with some of the confusions which the Dean of Durham offered us, some of my own feelings that, yes, I must accept responsibility for the bomb, for nuclear weapons, and yet at the same time I must renounce it. We are impeded by fear. I believe that our anxieties on strategies and balances and tactics corrupt us almost before we begin. I believe that we must take an example from those who survived the Hiroshima horror

and who are bringing out in the world some knowledge of how to deal with suffering and how to be redeemed through it. These Japanese people were not Christians, but there are Christian Japanese who have written movingly on the 'Silence of God', Shusaku Endo, and Kosuke Koyama on 'The Cross that has no Handle', the cross that has to be carried faithfully through the turmoil and the suffering of the world, the cross which does not have easy answers, which cannot be labelled multilateralist or unilateralist, but the cross which accepts suffering and lives through and redeems it.

When I next go to Japan, because of this debate and because the Church has had the courage to bring forth a report such as the Working Party has given us to think about, I shall try to go to Hiroshima, but not because of the memories enshrined in the monument, but so that I may say with the 13-year-old Hiroshima boy about that thing, that evil, that took his father's life, that wounded his mother and younger brother, 'The atom bomb, the atom bomb, it is the devil that took my father's life but I cannot bear a grudge against the atomic bomb; because of it the people of our city rose up to insist no more Hiroshimas, no more Hiroshimas; the people who died can be said to have sacrificed themselves for us, their sacrifices are invaluable, and we should walk the way of peace watched over by those noble victims' — and I say, not only those noble victims, but those noble people who learn and show us and teach us the way of peace which embraces evil, which accepts the suffering, and by the way of the cross can redeem it.

Mr P.H. Rippon (Norwich): I am sorry to disagree with the very moving speech of Mrs Flint, but my belief is that we do not in this debate start with Hiroshima. The dilemma of Christians is that we hate all weapons and the diversion of the world's resources into weaponry and armaments from the relief of poverty and suffering. Yes, we hate all weapons, and there is a bogus distinction in the Working Party's report between nuclear weapons and conventional weapons which I find disturbing. It acknowledges that nuclear weapons cannot be treated in isolation but proceeds to do just that, and indeed this is reflected in the main motion today. There is nothing in the 1980 debate to justify this restricted view,

nor in Paul Oestreicher's original motion. Indeed, the report before the Synod previously, *Christians in a Violent World*, expressly considered non-nuclear weapons. Has the nature of weaponry really changed so as to affect the Christian view of war? In the Battle of the Somme, 73,367 men were blown to such little bits that they could not be found or identified. Fifty million died in the Second World War, most of them innocent non-combatants. Does that really make any difference to God's reckoning? The allied bombing of Dresden, I read the other day, left so few survivors that there were not enough to bury the dead. In one week in 1945 the allies dropped 3/4 million napalm bombs on Tokyo — half the city was destroyed and 200,000 killed. And all this with conventional weapons 40 or more years ago. Indiscriminate mass destruction is no new phenomenon.

The human body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, wrote St Paul. Every corpse is an offence against God the Holy Spirit, the giver of life. Is God less offended if I batter you to death than if I merely shoot you, and do numbers affect theology? Does it matter less to our Heavenly Father if I kill, not 5,000, but 500 or 50 of his children?

It is the theology of this report that I find so weak. On Advent Sunday I sat in my parish church and nearly fell out of my pew when these words were read from Thessalonians: 'While they are talking of peace and security, all at once calamity is upon them and there will be no escape'. Why could not this theological report consider the doctrine of the parousia? Why could it not admit, in passing at least, that the power of the atom, like any other of God's gifts, is good and a source of blessing? It is the use that sinful men put it to that is evil. We have eaten of the tree. Even the word 'peace' has political overtones these days. It is time that some people remembered that the peace of God which passes all human understanding has more to do with men's hearts than with the United Nations.

So my conclusion is that the thrust of this report and its conclusions are, for all their theological clothes, political, and not only political but inconsistent. There is a class of actions, the report says, which are intrinsically evil and which corrupt the doer or the potential doer as well as the victim, and the report makes no bones about considering that nuclear deterrence is well within this class. Strong words indeed, but why, therefore, does the Working Party recommend, for instance, that Polaris be phased out? Is it OK to use this awful weapon in 1985 but not in 1995? The Working Party acknowledges that NATO is a nuclear defensive alliance, but says that we should remain shielded by it. It would be perfectly proper, the Working Party writes, for a Government

to say that it has no objection if another partner interposes a threat of nuclear retaliation to ward off an attack. When considering the intrinsic evil of the possession of nuclear weapons, these are indeed weasel words. On the basis of this report, would it not be more consistent to say that we repudiate the alliance? Should we not convert our allies so that they should not be corrupted as well?

I believe — and I agree with the report — that we cannot remain neutral in the division of the world between the Soviet *bloc* and the rest, nor can we be deaf to the pleading and suffering of our fellow Christians who are daily persecuted for the proclamation of their belief, which is so well documented by Keston College. Who can doubt, indeed, that our Brother Oestreicher, with his eccentric fiscal dissidence, would not be the first candidate for the Lubianka — and I do not mean to joke — and perhaps even a psychiatric hospital? They crush conscience, they control men's minds, they discourage worship and replace God with State. They are determined to exclude the Holy Spirit and extinguish the flame which burns in men's hearts to respond to the presence of God. You cannot pray 'Thy Kingdom come' and remain neutral. Indeed, with all its faults, I believe that we in this country are closer to God's Kingdom than they are in Russia.

In the face of such an opponent, as Christians we must say that the way of the peacemaker is not through neutrality or submission. Their oft repeated aim is to extend the frontiers of the Communist world, and they have consistently done so. They have multiplied their weapons and by threat or attack would have imperilled us. If we ever fell beneath their thrall, a new dark age would descend on us. The light of our Christianity, already obscured by too many bushels, would be all but extinguished. In time our Church would be strengthened by oppression; our cosiness and security is often our downfall; but I do not want to see a new age of Christian martyrs.

I believe, even so, that our duty is to avoid war at almost all costs. I fear that the proposal to withdraw the unarmed 'Endurance' from the South Atlantic, a wrong decision today, like that of the Oxford Union 50 years ago, could well be misunderstood and actually bring war closer. We need cool heads and clear minds. There is a difference between secure and insecure disarmament. There is a difference between attack and the effective deterrence of attack, between turning the other cheek and inviting your neighbour to strike you in the first place.

The irony is that the possession of nuclear weapons of awesome power has undoubtedly prevented war. We have lived through some pretty hairy

moments in Europe since 1945, and the Working Party admits it. War is no longer a viable option, it writes. I do not accept the arguments of the unilateralists that if we alone renounced nuclear weapons, others would follow. The Working Party could find no convincing candidate, and there does not seem to be much in the history of the Soviet Union to give us hope. They use tanks to quell students armed with sticks and they imprison half of Germany with barbed wire and machine guns. Actions speak louder than words. I do not think the Russian leaders are much inspired by good examples. You cannot set good examples to people who do not know the difference between good and bad.

In conclusion, I think that the earlier report, *Christians in a Violent World*, got it right. 'The record suggests,' it said, 'that peace and disarmament are two different things. If it is peace for which we are looking there will be something missing if we only pursue disarmament. It is hardly reasonable to expect 150 Governments to vote for disarmament when so many of them are afraid of their neighbours. We may reasonably ask them to disarm after their fear has been removed.' Winston Churchill said something similar: 'Until men's hearts are ruled by love they must be chained by fear.' Dr Popov, the exiled dissident from the Soviet Union, wrote something similar last year: 'Trust must be painstakingly built up; endless collaboration, endless rebuff, gradual agreements, step by step, until not only nuclear weapons are rejected as a means for settling conflict, but all weapons; we must overcome fear and trust promote.'

Last Sunday in our parish church we sang these words:

'Lead us, Father, into freedom,
From despair your world release,
That redeemed from war and hatred,
Men may come and go in peace;
Show us how through care and goodness,
Fear will die and hope increase.'

The Archbishop of York (Dr S. Y. Blanch): This debate is about the end of the world and about how we may best prevent it or delay it. Of course this is in remarkable contrast with our founders in the historic Church who fervently longed for the end of the world and eagerly awaited it. The Working Party's report itself is primarily concerned, as it has to be, with the moral and political issues and gives only incidental attention to the theological environment within which the moral and political issues have to be discussed. That, I think, is excusable, and I do not for one moment criticise it for that. But in the debate, as distinct from the report itself, the Church ought to be seen to be concerned with the theological,

not just with the moral and political issues. That is why I am glad that GS 542 did take up this matter, and I would just wish to underline certain aspects of it and to make certain ill-considered comments.

What is perhaps not generally realised is that the ancient world was haunted by the fear of universal disaster, less specific, of course, than our fears of a nuclear disaster, but every bit as real. They waited with dread the conjunction of the heavenly bodies that would spell the end of the world. It has long been argued in academic circles whether the so-called apocalypses of the New Testament are Jewish or Christian in origin. But whether Jewish or Christian in origin, they certainly reflect this universal haunting fear of some indescribable universal disaster written in the stars. Every tradition in the New Testament reflects it. What is distinctive about the Christian attitude to the end of the world is that it is associated with joy and not just fear. Hence the utterance of Christ himself, 'When you see all these things come to pass, lift up your heads, for your redemption draws near', is typical of the attitude towards the end of the world in the Gospels and elsewhere in the New Testament.

The prophets of the Old Testament were, as we know, heavily involved in the moral issues of their day and in the political decisions of their nation. They had a good deal to say about war and peace, about riches and poverty, about treaties and covenants, about arms and about disarmament, but they had even more to say about the transcendent God who called out the stars by number and regarded the nations as a drop in the bucket, who created the world and presided over its destiny. Thus, their moral and political judgments were made against the background of the unchanging providence of God who would act in his own time either to save or to destroy. It is this background that gives their oracles their permanence and their unfailing relevance, not just their political and moral prescriptions, which are clearly only relevant to their day.

The world will have to live forever now with the fear of nuclear disaster, either as a consequence of military action or of industrial accident. Nothing this Synod can say or do can alter that situation. The secret of nuclear power cannot be disinvented; the research laboratories of the world cannot be dismantled. There is no system of surveillance, however extensive and exact, which can actually prevent the manufacture of nuclear weapons. So, whilst we have to do everything in our power to reduce the likelihood of nuclear disaster, we cannot again ever exclude it. From now on every generation will be aware that it could be the last generation on the earth. So we are not dealing just with a moral or political issue but with a spiritual and theological one, namely, how to enable mankind to live with the fear, not just with the threat.

We clearly do not have a monopoly of political or moral wisdom in this Synod. But we do have a distinct theological position to represent, which could in the end be more important than the exact resolutions we may pass or may reject. We stand for the truth that it was a loving Creator who made the universe, that it is a loving Creator who presides over it, that it is a loving Creator who will determine the nature and the time of its end. No resolution in this Synod, no decision even by the Government, can defer or hasten the return of the Son of Man. It could be that in a strange way the wave of fear which is engulfing so many sections of our community may be a reminder of 'that lost great giant God who is risen once more against the world'.

You do not have to be a very diligent student of the New Testament to know that in New Testament parlance the antonym of faith is not unbelief but fear. Fear and faith cannot live together in the same heart and mind. With the wind high and the waves pouring over the boat, the Lord said to his disciples, 'Why are you afraid?' — with the Creator of the world, the alpha and the omega, apparently asleep in the stern.

Right political decisions, I believe, and right moral attitudes are more likely to emerge against this background of the universal and unfailing providence of God. The Church and the world have a right to expect that this theological reflection will be made clear in this debate, if not to the world, at least to the Church which ought to understand those words. We ought to be saying, 'When you see these things come to pass, lift up your heads, for your redemption draws near'.

The Provost of Southwark (Very Rev. D.L. Edwards): The very title *The Church and the Bomb* indicates the existence of two worlds, and I believe that it is an agonisingly difficult problem to connect these two worlds. The report has been criticised in the debate for confused ethics and weak theology. I welcome this confusion, I welcome this weakness, as the indication that the real anguish of our situation has been confronted.

There is the world of Jesus Christ. He not only told us to love our enemies; he lived and he died doing so. Into his infinite sensitivity he absorbed the humiliation and rejection, the nailing into helplessness, the overwhelming physical and mental pain. He did not hit back or curse back. That is the world of Jesus Christ, of the saints, and supremely of the martyrs. And it is the world of the Church — at least it is the world where the Church knows it ought to be — and many of us as members of the Church, indeed many moved by the spirit of the crucified outside the baptised ranks of the Church, have to some extent identified our-

selves in our lives with that patiently suffering, strangely victorious figure. Christians who have a pacifist vocation bear witness to that and they deserve to be honoured profoundly. They keep the Christian conversation clean.

But there is also the world of the bomb. My friend Mr Rippon asked what is the difference between nuclear weapons and other weapons. I will answer him. The difference is not only in the scale of casualties likely to ensue; the difference lies in the genetic and environmental damage inflicted. This is a new factor in warfare. The bomb is the hellish logic of humanity's hatred and aggression, the nightmare of history, the nightmare to which the Archbishop of York alluded in that deeply impressive address, the nightmare of history becoming a real possibility for our children and our civilisation, and now, as the Archbishop of York so rightly said, never to disappear from our descendants.

The world of the bomb is real. It has its own logic. In cold statistics the destruction of Hiroshima, of which there was that moving echo a few moments ago, saved lives. In the world of real politics the policy of deterrence has kept the peace when under any previous military conditions there would have been war between the super-powers. We have been reminded by the Falklands war of the danger of seeming to be unwilling to defend that which you are also unwilling to renounce. We were reminded of the danger of destabilising the balance of power in Europe by in any way wrecking NATO. That is the real world of the bomb.

How are these worlds to be joined together? In the current number of the *Economist* there is the crucifix and there is the bomb. How do the two meet? Not all the wisdom of the economists can answer that question. I express deep gratitude, which I am sure the overwhelming majority of the Synod, the majority of the Church, the majority of the country, feels that the country has taken this debate seriously on a report which combines intellectual power with prophetic courage. I am proud to belong to a Church which can produce such a report, and I am deeply thankful for the coverage in the media, whether that coverage has been irresponsible, as often it has been, or shallow, as it has been inevitably. The Church is at last standing where, for example, so many young people stand. I expect most of us have children whose hearts are with the Greenham Common women. At last we can look our children in the eye, to some extent at any rate.

The report has been criticised for forgetting that the heart of the Christian religion is the individual's relationship with God. *The Times* pontificated on that theme. But, no, the heart of the Christian religion is the prayer, 'Father, your Kingdom come on earth as in Heaven'. God's Kingdom must somehow come in this world of the bomb.

The report has been criticised for forgetting that the Soviet Union is utterly evil. Paul Johnson advanced that argument in an article in *The Times*. We have heard the Bishop of London, who is normally much more statesmanlike than Paul Johnson — who is New Statesmanlike — even saying that the Soviet Union do not have justice in their vocabulary. Of course they have justice in their vocabulary; they are constantly saying 'peace and justice'; and it is possible to enter into dialogue with them as to what these words mean. Mr Rippon said that the Russians do not know the difference between good and evil, or at least their Government does not. I do not believe this. They are human beings. And the greatest novels of our time have come from Russian authors.

The report is criticised for being too complicated, and indeed it is complicated, but we are in a situation where it seems that the American Catholic bishops are being leant on in the Vatican to moderate their denunciation of the deterrent. If that sort of thing goes on in the Roman Catholic Church, acknowledging the complexities of the situation, surely in the Church of England of all bodies we ought to admit that life is not simple.

I would end, however, by pleading for another report even at this early stage. It would be out of order for me to consider the amendments, but the amendments do raise questions about NATO policy. Indeed the Working Party says that we should stay within NATO and accept the American nuclear umbrella over NATO, although we should cancel our independent strategic deterrent. This is a policy with which I happen to agree, but it does put the moral onus on NATO, and I do urge that this Synod, however it decides today about the report, should in due course commission, and if necessary pay for, a study by Christians who belong to NATO countries of NATO's moral responsibilities. It is extremely important, I believe, not to get out of step with our fellow Christians in the USA and in Western Europe. They agonise over these problems as we do. They have much to teach us, although I am happy to say that many Americans and many Europeans have said to me that they know of no document in the whole debate comparable in quality with this document which the Church of England has now produced.

Mrs A.M. Bell (Chelmsford): I am grateful for having been called to speak in this debate, and I should like to speak on behalf of the mothers of this land. Many mothers are demonstrating against the bomb in many parts of the world and are meeting much hostility. I feel that I should like an opportunity to express their feelings. I speak for no particular party, but as the mother of a large family who has tried to reason out some of the answers. I am not an expert in any one field, except possibly in the field of motherhood.

We are this week considering the Church and the bomb and the destruction of God's creation. I would first like to bring some sentences to the Synod's attention from this awe-inspiring report of the Working Party. On page 106 it states: 'The Old Testament is clear that creation is an action of God and not of humankind, and that its ultimate purposes and aims are beyond human understanding. The trusteeship which men and women exercise over creation enables them to participate in God's plan. This is what human freedom is for and it carries immense responsibilities. It is a freedom which can be used for good or evil.'

The highest privilege between men and women is to create, and in that creation we are ever conscious of the activity of God, and God sent his son into the world to be creative as Jesus Christ of the Virgin Mary, and to save the world. In a home we find a creative living force which is a habitation of God, with all its joys, sacrifices and revelations. God has conferred much responsibility on women, and though not all women are called to be wives and mothers, all women are called to exercise their womanhood, and often in an extended motherhood.

Today we women feel that we are at risk again as we see military science getting out of control and a global arms trade which has no end. Young mothers with babies and toddlers of today's world weep for their children and are overwhelmed with fear. They see a sense of hopelessness around them. In the late 1950's I had two children when there were considerable nuclear tests being carried out, and I have not forgotten that sense of horror. I wondered what I had done by bringing those children into the world. In the mid-1960's I was travelling in Suffolk near the coast and I saw four rockets pointed into the sky to be let off at a moment's notice. Again, I had small children with me and the sickness in my heart stayed for many months.

Since then I have sought and been calmed by Christ's living presence, and I have been aware of God's eternal plan for us, but I had to wait for many years to receive that assurance. The women who demonstrate do not have that assurance. I hope that with this report we can challenge the

worldly world and help people to face a nuclear threat which cannot go away. I want to see this report going right down to the grassroots so that we can all have prayerful discussion, but in our prayers we must be clear that God came to save and redeem mankind and that the commandment that we shall not kill will be foremost in our minds. We want a groundswell of public opinion that will be global and that will acknowledge that it is in the Church of Christ that we will find the Prince of Peace. We ourselves as members of the Synod of the Church of England must be God's messengers of peace.

Lt-Cdr C.P.N. Wells-Cole (Lincoln): Mindful of your remarks at the beginning of the debate, Mr Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the question be now put."

This motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of London, in reply: I am very grateful to all those who have contributed to this stage of the debate. It is clear that every one of us, whatever our views, shares the agony of our dilemma. I would like to comment briefly on one or two of the speeches, but I do not propose to take time in commenting on all of them, and I hope that the Synod will forgive me.

I refer first to one point made by the Dean of Durham about the reference I made to Armageddon, which I think he misunderstood. In using that quotation from Prof. Simon, I simply wanted to remind the Synod that in fact we deserve the situation we now face because of our disobedience to God, but God is staying his hand, and I said then that we must not wait passively for Armageddon and we must not, as it were, use the expectation of that as a cloak for our idleness and sloth and lack of effort to work for peace. What I believe the Book of Revelation says to us is that we cannot expect the peace of God unless we are prepared to face the cost which it entails; and God is giving us a moment, and the question we face is how are we to use it? This point was also taken up by the Archbishop of York, and his speech for me pinpointed the agony which we face.

If I may refer for a moment to Mrs Bell and what she said about the feelings of mothers, which are shared to some extent, though I appreciate to a lesser degree, by fathers and by grandfathers, I do not think there was a word in her speech with which I could not have agreed. The question is, how do we in fact preserve the future for our grandchildren? That is the issue on which we are divided. We must face it. We can only answer it in the depths of our conscience, but we must not suppose, any

of us, that there is a cheap and quick solution. Whichever way we believe to be right, it is going to call from all of us the deepest and most costly response in the situation which we have created for ourselves.

If I may make one comment on Mrs Flint's speech, which moved me deeply; I am very glad that she said what she did about the power of redemptive suffering. I would like by way of comment simply to say that those who advocate deterrence have as their main aim the prevention of war and suffering and not the waging of it. I do not believe that we actually have the right in God's eyes to seek to suffer that we may redeem it. I believe we humbly receive it when it comes to us and then seek to redeem it. This is the paradox of some of the things she was saying. It is for me the paradox of the pacifist position, that there are occasions, even though I am not a pacifist, when one feels called upon to suffer, but I do not believe I have the right to go out and seek it, nor to require it of others.

In conclusion, I would like to say a word about what the Provost of Southwark said. I find it actually rather difficult to answer him. In my speech I made it very clear, as clear as I could, that I was not speaking about the Russian people, or the American people, or European people, but about declared policies and stances which we cannot ignore. We ask people to take ourselves at face value and mean what we say. We must do the same for others. Although you may find the word 'justice' in a Leninist manual, I cannot see that it means what we mean by the word, if for no other reason than that the standard which is used to determine what it means is the promotion of Leninist views. I happen to have a book called 'The Rights and Duties of Soviet Citizens', which I acquired in Moscow. It is an extremely interesting book; it uses much the same language, but it does not mean the same things.

I would just make the point to the Provost of Southwark that the Board itself in its comments did not run away from the responsibility of trying to see how the two worlds meet. In moving the next motion, I shall be saying a little about that relationship. We did not say that the Church is simply confined to saving individuals, although I believe that we minimise that at our peril. We must not today fall into that error (some of you will have heard me quote this so many times) of which T.S. Eliot spoke of seeking to escape from the darkness outside the view by dreaming of systems so perfect that no one will need to be good. Certainly we have to be concerned with individuals, but we must also be concerned with that real world and give real advice and not be, as Christians have sometimes been accused of being, escapist looking for

that which we would like to have but which we are not prepared to face the cost of working for.

The motion was put and carried.

Sir William van Straubenzee (Oxford): On a point of order. Am I correct in understanding that it is our usual request to those who are such welcome visitors in our galleries, as, of course, distinct from our colleagues who are sitting up there because of the overflow, that they should not join by way of applause or otherwise at the end of any speech, and if that is correct, would you feel it appropriate to make it clear from the Chair?

The Chairman: That is correct, and I hope they will have heard it.

The Bishop of London: I beg to move:

‘That this Synod recognising —

(a) the urgency of the task of making and preserving peace;
and

(b) the extreme seriousness of the threat made to the world by contemporary nuclear weapons and the dangers in the present international situation,

calls upon H.M. Government, together with our allies in NATO,

(i) to reduce progressively its dependence upon nuclear weapons in its programme for defence; and

(ii) to work to strengthen international treaties especially as they apply to the possession and use of such weapons.’

This motion represents the considered judgment of the Board as to what it is right and proper for the Synod to say to Her Majesty’s Government, and I would remind the Synod respectfully that it is the Government whom we are addressing in this motion. We are not making observations of which we hope someone will take note. We are not presenting ideals or principles which we ask people to take into account when making practical decisions. We are addressing those who have the responsibility for making such decisions on behalf of our country, decisions which have to be made in the light of the situation which actually confronts us, and I believe we have to be very realistic about this; and it is, I believe, lacking in Christian responsibility to urge courses upon people which we know in fact are not practical suggestions for them. If we believe that there are no practical possibilities that people in certain positions should have, then the only thing we can do is to tell them to resign and to get themselves out of those situations.

Before spelling out our recommendations to the Government, we make two remarks. The first expresses our recognition of the urgent task of making and preserving peace. As the Board says, the test of peace has to be put against all policy options; both multilateral and unilateral options have to be tested in the present situation for their practical contribution to establishing and keeping peace. We have a very heavy responsibility for ensuring that whatever is said or resolved today will be conducive to the making and preserving of peace and will not make war more likely. But we do have to recognise the kind of peace which is possible in our present situation.

If we are to test the policy options, we have to recognise that peace in the world today cannot simply be established by the expression of good will. The human race, being what it is at every level, beginning with ourselves, needs restraints to prevent us from pursuing our own ends at the expense of others. As I said in moving the previous motion, I do not feel that we can dare to ask for more than that fragile peace which is all that our sinfulness allows. This, I would suggest, is in no way incompatible with the command to love our enemies or the responsibility to pray for the leaders and those in positions of power in all nations, and I would ask you all, with humility, how many of us here do actually pray regularly for the leaders of all the nations, including those who differ ideologically from ourselves? Indeed, our intentions in working for peace must be continually purified by such prayers lest our desire for peace be corrupted and become the instrument of self-righteousness, violence or bitterness towards those who differ from us as to the ways in which it is most likely to be achieved.

So it is that the second statement in the motion refers to the extreme seriousness of the threat made to the world by contemporary nuclear weapons and the dangers in the present international situation. The bomb is with us, never to be disinvented. However much we wish, it will not go away, and it is the greatest folly to suppose that any action or gesture on our part can make it do so. But that very fact may, and I would say can, make us come face to face with what we are like as human beings and make us realise that peace-making is hard and demanding work requiring patience, humility, courage and perseverance, with no available short-cuts.

With those considerations in mind, we then call upon the Government, that is, upon those in positions of power and responsibility, to do certain things. We call upon the politicians — and politicians are those who, while keeping in front of them what is desirable, have the duty to use their skill, wisdom and courage to discover what is attainable. A

politician cannot be rescued from the duty of making judgments about what would be most likely to achieve peace in the light of a clear assessment of the situation, and we who do not know all the facts, and cannot know all of them, have to be sensitive, and we must not take to ourselves decisions which can only be made with integrity by those who do.

We call also upon our allies in NATO. In doing so, we recognise what is often overlooked, that in NATO and the EEC, whatever may be the problems, we have a group of nations the principal ones of whom, in the not very distant past, were traditional enemies, who engaged at times in massive and horrific conflict, actually working together. At heads of state level, at ministerial level and at civil service level, they sit down regularly to discuss their mutual problems of varying degrees of international and domestic significance, and to resolve them in ways which do not involve military conflict. It so happens that I am a member of the committee in the Lords on the EEC, and I now see evidence of the way in which the nations are working together, whatever be the problems. This is a truly remarkable achievement by any standard. It is my belief that never again will we have to contemplate or fear the outbreak of war between members of the Community. That is behind us. It is a remarkable achievement, and we must not allow its significance to be obscured by wine lakes or butter mountains. Nor must we undermine it or put it at risk. If we are speaking of cooperation, of harmony, of nations working together, let us at least recognise what has been achieved and try to strengthen and preserve it.

What we call upon Her Majesty's Government and our allies in NATO to do is, first, to reduce progressively our dependence on nuclear weapons, and, secondly, to work to strengthen international treaties, especially as they apply to the possession and use of such weapons. These resolutions have been described in the press as bland. I do not believe that adjective is justified. They do not represent the lowest common denominator emerging from a divided Board. They represent realistic action which we believe is most likely to ensure peace, and we also believe in the Board that they do represent a consensus to which this Synod might be able to agree. There is general agreement that the present level of nuclear weapons is unnecessarily high, particularly if one believes that a balance of power is necessary, and even by those who advocate a policy of deterrence as most likely to prevent war. Clearly there is disagreement about the way in which this should be achieved without increasing the likelihood of war and of destabilising the present situation. I shall be speaking to this when I comment on the Bishop of Salisbury's amendment, the vote on which will give members of the

Synod the opportunity to express their judgment on recommendations 18-20 of the Working Party which advocate unilateral disarmament on the part of the United Kingdom.

With regard to the second recommendation, I would first say that we must not under-estimate what has been done and what is now happening. We must both appreciate it and at the same time do nothing which would undermine the incentive to negotiate, an incentive which man, as he is, always needs. It is not generally recognised that since the war there have been 14 international treaties or conventions all of which, with the exception of the Biological Weapons Convention of 1972 and the Weaponry Convention of 1981, have involved some kind of restriction and control on nuclear weapons. What I believe is needed from the Synod today is the greatest possible encouragement to those who are engaged in the present negotiations in Geneva. While I believe that we must be utterly realistic about the present situation, I also believe that as Christians we must urge those who are so engaged to take seriously all gestures which are made, even though the motives may be felt to be suspect. It is our duty to encourage every effort and to urge Governments not to abandon resolution in the search for peace, nor to lose hope in the face of continual difficulties in achieving agreement.

The Rev. M.J. Saward (London): Two years ago I had dinner on the West Coast of the USA with J.R. Ewing and his 'daddy' Jock; not the actual Ewings but a carbon copy — two oil bankers who could have been taken for them. One of them said in the course of dinner, 'We must get in first, press that button, and take out 80 million Russians before they know what has hit them'. I sat feeling sick with the bland horror of it.

There is a peculiar irony, I think, that having got caught up with all the fuss about the National Anthem last August and having been called 'a lefty, trendy, pacifist, unilateralist, Marxist radical', here I am hoping in due course to move a rather 'hawkish' proposal in this debate. I hope that perhaps a few Tory extremists will take note of this.

Why am I wanting to move this amendment? In 1937, at a time when nobody will need reminding of the pressure upon us, Winston Churchill said, 'Always look back on the history of the past, study it and meditate upon it'. I have done this ceaselessly for the last 25 years in my reading, well over 100 books on military history. It is one of my main interests.

What lessons have I learnt, especially from the 1930's? Some years ago a senior television executive said to me, 'Well, of course, the thing about Christians is that you are supposed to trust people', and I smiled wryly,

because the first lesson that I believe I have learnt from the reading of history is that, however well meaning you may be, it is an act of credulous and gullible folly to trust totalitarian dictators whether of the left or the right. Lord Birkenhead said of Viscount Halifax, 'He was unwilling to recognise the naked reality of evil'. He did not believe that Hitler and Mussolini meant what they said. *Mein Kampf* had said it all. Yet Chamberlain could say of Hitler, 'Here was a man who could be relied upon when he had given his word'. In other words, 'Herr Hitler was a gentleman'.

What, then, of Marx, Lenin and Stalin? What of Khrushchev? What of Brezhnev? What of Andropov, ex-gentle shepherd of the KGB? 'We do not,' said Lenin, 'believe in morality. We have no scruples — any trick, ruse or lie will do. If necessary we will wipe out 9/10ths of the population'. Ah, you may say, this is just rhetoric; this is bombast. That is what the wide-eyed Tories of the 1930's believed about the dictators — Hitler, a man who could be relied upon when he gave his word. And he could! He did everything he said he was going to do, and that was the appalling thing about it. What he promised he achieved — scorched earth, Auschwitz, 55 million dead.

So what of the Marxists? I did not say the Russians; I said the Russian Marxists. One on television last week was quoted as saying, 'We do not believe in turning the other cheek, we believe in force'. Katyn, the Gulags, more than a million slaughtered in the 1930's, the suppression of nonconformity, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Afghanistan. Is it all just rhetoric?

I have a friend who is married to a Czech. She left Prague 15 years ago. My friend tells me that every time the doorbell rings, every time the knocker knocks, she stiffens with latent fear, 15 years on.

The second lesson I have learned from my reading of history is that no nation is lily-white. We are not. The USA certainly is not. But the easy parallel which some members of the Synod will, I believe, make, and have certainly made outside this chamber, between Andropov and Reagan ignores evident facts. The West is morally fairly rotten, I suppose, in all sorts of ways, but its core ideology, such as it is, is still democracy, freedom and Christian ethics, however far in reality we may depart from them. Where are our labour camps? Where is our police state? Are you frightened when the doorbell rings or the knocker knocks? That is a key question.

I understand Russian fears of encirclement and invasion. They have very good grounds historically for those fears. I understand the Russian conviction that the West, and especially the United States, paid practically no price in the Second World War in contrast to their 20 million dead and their vast destruction. I understand from my visits to the United States that most Americans have no concept of that, and it is a great tragedy. I recognise the paranoia which exists on both sides. But the whole philosophy of Marxism is expansionist, ruthless and indifferent to anything except the overthrow of all opposition. That has been said again and again today.

These two lessons do not lead me to hate Russians or to want to kill Russians, although I am conscious that some Americans do. No, I will gladly vote for progressive multilateral disarmament if that can be achieved.

But the lessons of history teach me three facts. Pastor Georgi Vins, when he came out of Russia three or four years ago, said, 'Atheism invested with power creates tyranny'. That is a lesson I cannot ignore.

Secondly, the lesson I learn is that pacifism is no answer in public morality (except to the private conscience of the pacifist; he can feel guiltless — it may be very painful for him to do that, but he can feel guiltless, even if an Auschwitz occurs). I respect pacifism, I respect my pacifist friends, but I have to say that I believe that it is in public and international terms morally too easy.

The third lesson I learn, as Leonard Cheshire has put it (and he should have some experience of this) is that, 'It is hardly conceivable that a State would commit an act of war which it knew would have catastrophic consequences to itself. Nuclear weapons by virtue of their immense destructive power make it impossible for one nuclear power to attack another and therefore offer the threefold hope of no conventional war, no nuclear war, and no subjugation imposed by force.' That is the lesson, I believe, which is indisputable in post-war Europe. It needs including in our motion today so that the Government, if they receive this motion, should understand that we are not simply looking to the present and the future, but that we understand the past and are not credulous or gullible.

You may not have, I may not have, the easy conscience of the declared and committed pacifist on this. You and I will certainly be appalled by the brute power contained in nuclear weapons and the thought of its possible use. You might well be forced, as I believe I would be, to hate

any actions our nation might be driven to *in extremis*. God willing, you and I would feel the moral agony that goes with that. But this is no soft option for the button-happy Americans or the button-happy anybody. This is the painful duty, I believe, of those who choose freedom.

Sir William van Straubenzee (Oxford): I realise that members of the Synod, looking at me now, find it very difficult to appreciate that I was ever a young soldier, but if they consulted my fellow cadet, Stanley Booth-Clibborn, he would say that that was possible — and a mighty smart young soldier he was too! I was a young soldier of 22 when I came out of Burma and India and was regrouping for what was clearly to be a bloodthirsty invasion of what we then called Malaya. We contemplated hopping from island to island on our way to Japan, and at that moment a bomb of stupendous size which we could not fully comprehend dropped and it killed 340,000 people. We had as a background the knowledge that 200,000 had been killed by conventional weapons in the American attack on Okinawa. We knew that 110,000 Japanese had been killed in Burma by conventional weapons — and I rather wished when I heard the deeply sincere speech of Mrs Flint and understood her feelings that we could perhaps have been reminded of the balance in these matters. Those 38 years ago as a young man you can hardly blame me — with my life, I hoped, in front of me, profoundly grateful for having got that far — for being thankful that it brought the war to a sudden halt.

Those 38 years ago I came to two conclusions on which I was profoundly right on one and profoundly wrong on the other. My first conclusion was that we would never have dared to drop that bomb on them if they had had a bomb like that to drop on us, and I believe that was true then and it remains, I hope, true today. The second conclusion was that I thought, 'Oh, we start again the cycle of great wars only in a new generation of hideous weapons'. Remember, it was not a surprising thought for a 22-year old young man in those long ago days. It is so often forgotten that the close of the first war was as close to the outbreak of the second war as 1962 is to today, and the first war hung over me and those of my age like a terrible cloud. In my own family, my mother's large family of young and joyful cousins, every single eligible male life was slaughtered in that first war, every single one of them; and when, therefore, the Provost of Southwark seeks to say to me that there is a new factor today, namely, the genetic, I accept, of course, that the scale is infinitely larger, but you can hardly remove every male life from a family without an obvious genetic effect on them.

I have lived as a young man through the appeasements of the inter-war years, I have watched the failure to keep up our defences, and I have

cursed, not my father, bless him, but my father's crippled generation — and I think we must sometimes remember they were a crippled generation because of the first war — and cursed that they ever let fall our guard, for we thought and I still think we need never have had to add 1939/45 to our war memorials.

Now, at 59, I hear the same seductive voices. We are all groping for the truth, but I think the truth is that every generation is given its responsibility to stand up to it. The scale is immeasurably larger; indeed, it could enter into fields we have hardly discussed, for example, germ warfare. But I do not believe that the problem goes away, and it is our responsibility to stand up to the decisions we have to make. But in the end it will come down to human considerations. If I were in the Kremlin at a time of crisis, trying to decide whether or not a people would in the ultimate use a weapon of unbelievable destruction in their own defence, one of the factors I would weigh is the unquestioned response of almost the entire British people — not entire but nearly entire — when in recent months they responded to the invasion of territory for which they had responsibility by a fascist dictatorship. I think that response may well have done more than any other thing of recent years to maintain peace, and how I wish we had reacted in similar circumstances between the wars.

So what must we do? We must press ceaselessly by diplomatic activity for supervised, balanced, multilateral disarmament, and meanwhile maintain our defences. Here we bring to this situation two distinct understandings. The one has been mentioned more than once, but it has to be said again, for I have heard it being received from around me and perhaps elsewhere, with disapproval; but the fact is that the regime with which we deal, not the people — the distinction made by the Bishop of London is most important — the regime is militantly atheist and hostile to all that we stand for here in this Synod. Secondly, that terrible, unbelievably awful as are the scale of these modern weapons, we surely as a Synod do not accept the phrase 'annihilation', when applied to them, about which we have a special and deeply held teaching.

Opposite the small cottage in a village soon to come into the Diocese of Salisbury — but not without a little apprehension on the part of some of the retired majors! — in that cottage I am immediately opposite the war memorial, and I am there, and I am only there, because of a name upon it, my namesake Bill, whom I never knew — 19, five days to die out on the wire because nobody could get to him. It is my earnest prayer that provided we learn the lessons of the past and apply them with courage but not aggression, it will not be necessary, I pray, for those who come

after me either at the going down of the sun or in the morning to remember anybody else.

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Rev. J.A. Baker): Because the amendment in my name is largely technical in character, perhaps the Synod will forgive me if I do not repeat the theological considerations we have already heard but try to clear up some rather important misconceptions and clarify some of the practical issues before us.

The intense public discussion of the nuclear weapons issue has made it clear that much thinking on this subject, even at the highest levels, is dominated by two fallacies.

The first fallacy is the belief that mutual nuclear deterrence is a reasonably stable condition, and likely to remain so. Any such belief is an illusion. The overwhelming evidence is that mutual nuclear deterrence is becoming less stable year by year, and so less plausible as a means of keeping the peace.

It is important to understand the reasons for this, as they have a bearing on what policies it is wisest to pursue. One reason, of course, is that massive growth in the numbers of weapons increases the risk of accident; another, that the more weapons you have, the more personnel you need, and the greater the chance of human error.

But the real danger comes from another quarter, namely, the much greater accuracy of the new types of weapons systems. It is now possible to land even fairly long-range warheads very close indeed to their targets, and this gives you the capacity to knock out the other side's weapons rather than just devastating their cities. At present it is only possible to destroy land-based missiles, aircraft on the ground, or submarines in harbour. Submarines at sea, or missile-carrying aircraft on patrol out of interception range, are as yet more or less invulnerable. But both super-powers are trying hard to improve their effectiveness in the field of what is called counter-force strategy.

Obviously, however, if you are going to destroy the enemy's missiles you must do it before he has a chance to fire them. You must strike first. The Soviet SS-20 and the US Pershing 2, with their great accuracy and short flight times, are such 'first-strike' weapons. Cruise missiles are rather different. They are not, as often alleged, first-strike weapons. They are far too slow. The enemy would have time to retaliate before they arrived. But because they can be fired off a lorry on any suitable patch of ground they are very hard to detect; and an enemy might feel

that his best course was to hit them on their base before they were dispersed to their firing-points. They could be a powerful incentive to an enemy to strike first.

This illustrates very well the glaring danger of this whole situation. You might think that if the enemy has first-strike weapons you need them too, for if he can get in first and knock out your missiles, you need to get in earlier still and knock out his. But think what this means. In any serious crisis the leaders in each camp will be asking, 'How long dare we leave it?' If you wait too long, the penalty could be not only horrific devastation of your own country but inability to retaliate effectively. Under such pressures any leaders are all too likely to be stampeded. The next world crisis will not be a slow-moving one. Next time the missiles will be in position and the flight time will be five minutes. A suspicious radar reading, a negative dispatch from a negotiator, may be enough to evoke the fatal order. The truth is that the new generation of nuclear weapons will not hold nations back from war. In a crisis they will drive them into it.

We are constantly urged to take the realities of power seriously. All right; let us do so. Let us face what we are asking of our leaders in acquiescing in this madness — the impossible demands we are making on them. If they are to evolve into seeing clearly what is happening, we must have the wisdom and the courage to try to extricate them from undertaking a task in which the odds are a thousand to one on failure and catastrophic results for us all.

There are many steps that could be taken to ease this danger. One is recommendation (3) in *The Church and the Bomb*: 'renewed and determined efforts . . . to secure a comprehensive test ban treaty,' for without testing new and even more destabilising systems cannot be developed. But equally vital is to start cutting the number of existing nuclear weapons, in particular those usable in a first strike. For, paradoxical though it may seem, even to possess your own first-strike capability actually endangers peace.

This brings us to our second fallacy: deterrence demands parity. It seems to be cardinal to the thinking of all those who support present deterrence policies that whatever weapons one side has the other must have also, and in equal numbers. In fact this is quite illogical. I detect here the continued domination of our thinking by the model of the 1930's — not the 1930's in their lessons about evil tyrannies and dictatorships, but militarily; the lesson that if the other side has a thousand tanks you need a thousand tanks or an equivalent weight of anti-tank weapons. But in

nuclear warfare this model is irrelevant and thinking based upon it is illogical. Leaving aside for a moment the question of morality, we must think how deterrence is meant to work.

True deterrence depends on convincing the enemy that attack will cost him a price he is not prepared to pay. To achieve this you need three things: your deterrent must be large enough to inflict that degree of damage; you must be able to deliver it to the target; and it must, like the submarine force, be invulnerable to a first strike. Once these principles are grasped, it is clear that both East and West have many times more weapons than they need for deterrence, and that either side could cut many systems unilaterally without jeopardising its security in the least. Nor will it be until one side does cut in this way that the other will realise that it is wasting its resources on a mass of technological clutter which gives it no advantage.

Those who argue for the deterrent on moral grounds do it in the belief that it is the best guarantee of peace, but on those terms we must remember that if deterrence is to be an effective strategy for peace, it must be developed in a way that is unmistakably defensive, not aggressive, and must deploy only enough weapons for its purpose and no more.

The heart of the moral concern for every one of us, as the Bishop of London said, is the building of peace. Much has been said, and eloquently, about the iniquity of nuclear weapons. The fact that, however carefully targeted they maybe, they inevitably kill and injure non-combatants; their spreading of cancer and genetic damage world-wide; their poisoning of the environment for decades to come; the horrors they inflict on the helpless animal creation; the point (too little regarded) that because no medical teams can be allowed, or are supposed to be allowed, into the radioactive areas for two weeks we have for the first time in history a weapon which means leaving the agonisingly injured in hundreds of thousands to die without even a human voice or hand to ease their passing — all this leaves us no choice but to work unremittingly for the outlawing of these devices, which are already in blatant violation of all existing international conventions on war-making. To rely on them, as some have suggested, to preserve so-called 'peace' for evermore is unthinkable, not just because of the danger but because they poison the international atmosphere with fear and suspicion, and because it is moral damnation to invest our God-given powers and resources in endlessly developing such things and conditioning people to use them. They must go — but how?

Pope John Paul has said that the nuclear deterrent may still be morally acceptable as a means of buying time to negotiate the balanced elimination of nuclear weapons. But time could be appallingly short. How do we both make that breathing space more stable and speed up the disarmament process, which has so far yielded such meagre results?

One way for the West as a whole to achieve these linked objectives might be this: to stand firm on collective defence and the NATO alliance, with strong conventional forces; to denuclearise its defences as much as possible: for example, to replace over a period its tactical nuclear weapons with the new, equally effective conventional ones; to phase out first-strike weapons like Pershing 2 and those which incite first strike by the other side, such as Cruise missiles; to phase out obsolescent systems, such as the F111 aircraft and the free-fall bomb; to make a cut in the total western strategic deterrent, but not one large enough to jeopardise security, and then to invite the Soviet Union to make a similar cut; to press on more vigorously still with multilateral disarmament negotiations; to maintain a firm foreign policy, and to keep up pressure for human rights; to work hard for a comprehensive test ban treaty.

This policy, phased disengagement from nuclear deterrents, is the one advocated in *The Church and the Bomb*. This is the policy proposed in the amendment. It has been labelled 'unilateralist,' but its whole philosophy is essentially multilateralist. The fact is that these words 'unilateralism' and 'multilateralism' are thoroughly misleading, and it is significant that the World Council of Churches now recommends dropping them altogether. In *The Church and the Bomb* we dismissed pure total unilateralism by the West as fantasy; what we proposed is what I have described, to stimulate general disarmament by a safe, controlled and modest independent western initiative by phasing out the small British contribution to the western deterrent, which is no more than 5 per cent, over a period and in consultation with our allies and by refusing to go along with the new destabilising weapons. The Bishop of London's picture of the EEC and NATO was, I think, somewhat bland. The history of those organisations shows that progress in policy has often come about through members not hesitating to make powerful independent initiatives.

All this would not enable Britain to wash its hands of any association with nuclear weapons, nor is it meant to. We have thought throughout in terms of collective western defence and so we must think in terms of collective responsibility. But we believe that taking one smaller nation out of the world nuclear line-up altogether, in accordance with our obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty which we and three other

nuclear weapon States signed in 1968 and have not yet honoured, would have the greatest impact on a world poised to spread nuclear weapons far and wide.

As we heard earlier, the Church has lately been advised to keep off policy and concentrate on individual spiritual life. But if someone tells us as Christian individuals that their life is in a mess, we do not only suggest to them how to get an experience of God in Christ. We also discuss with them how to put things right. Our duty in this matter of nuclear weapons also includes discussing how to put things right. Otherwise our moral judgments are so much pious irrelevance. I do not think the Working Party has deserved some of the appreciation it has been given for heroic, prophetic utterance; our proposals were much more cautious and modest; but I do believe that, whether our personal moral concern is primarily for security, as it may properly be, or for true Christian discipleship and human concern for right, the policies in my amendment offer the best way to give light to them that sit in darkness and the shadow of death and to guide their feet into the way of peace.

Dame Margaret Shepherd (Hereford): I wish that I had been clever enough to think up the amendment on the Notice Paper in the name of Canon Williams, for it says what I believe, but since it is not likely to be called, I am rising to speak to oppose part of the motion now before us, because it calls on us and on our allies to reduce their nuclear weapons but does not call on other nations to do the same. That to me seems to be a recipe for trouble, the world being what it is. Aggressors who think they have an advantage can very easily be tempted to use that advantage. Throughout history there have been bullies amongst nations who, thinking they have superiority in arms, rise to take what it is they want, and sometimes world domination is their aim.

Peace-loving nations wish to be left alone, but this did not stop many nations falling to Germany in the 1930's, because they were neither big enough nor strong enough to resist her, and in the present day, did Afghanistan want to fight Russia, did the Falklands first attack the Argentine? It is the big bullies who seek, as they have always done, to take over smaller peace-loving peoples by whatever means, and that is the tale that many countries in Europe know today. Remember that the bear likes honey, but he shuns the porcupine. An undefended country can be a bait for bullies and robbers: ask Poland, which did indeed fight hard to defend itself, but it has been a prey for many years to enemies too big for it.

We are ourselves today a peace-loving people, in spite of what some of you may think about the Falklands. We do not parade our forces annually as Hitler did in Nuremberg and the Russians in Moscow on May Day; but if we had no defence, or no equivalent defence, against the horrifying weapons of today we too might fall like other nations in our lifetime and watch those of our families who are not found pleasing to our new masters, either on grounds of race or religion or because of their love for their own country, suffer the fate that three million of his own people did under Stalin and twenty million under the Nazis. If such tyrants can be so brutal to their own people, what would they be to ours? Is that the heritage that we should leave our children, if indeed any were left?

I have seen the specially designed chamber where they killed Bonhoeffer, with specially built gullies to take away the blood. Such people — and there are such, regardless of nationality — would have no inhibitions about dropping nuclear bombs if they thought they could annihilate all opposition and become masters of the world.

I believe that God invited man to enter into partnership with him and work with him to make the world nearer to how he would like it to be. You will all remember the old story of the man who was told this by his vicar and who replied, 'Yes, God and I work together in my garden, but you should see what it looks like if I leave it all to him'. We have to play our part too. David, highly favoured of God, had to fight the giant. God did not say, 'David, you sit down and I will cause that giant chap to have a heart attack'. No, David had to play his part and summon up his courage, and through trust in his great Saviour in life he stood his ground to face the advancing terrifying enemy, and when he was near enough, having kept his cool to the last moment, he used his sling to destroy him. Although later perhaps he overdid things a bit, for most of his battles he felt that there was one who was fighting with him, and because of that one he won the day against enormous odds. But God did not say to him, 'You stay at home and have no part in the battles'. He knew that if he did not play his part, then neither would God. We do not even have to go to battle if we stay sufficiently well armed to make it not worth the enemy attacking us or our peace-loving friends — and do remember that Hitler believed in breaking the bunch of sticks one by one, a very successful recipe for a while; but we must stick to our allies and not expect them to drop the bomb for us while we piously renounce it.

By all means we must work for peace, but we must maintain parity of these terrifying weapons, hopefully diminishing them by painstaking negotiation, with inspection allowed, as the Devil notoriously cheats, and

the serpent is cunning. There is no glamour in this work, only infinite patience. It is work that requires both prayer and watchfulness. For years I was puzzled by that phrase 'watch and pray'. What help is just watching, I wondered, until recently a Billy Graham leaflet arrived in my letter-box, and it explained that 'watch' is meant in the sense of the watchman on the tower who keeps on the alert and warns his people if he sees an enemy approach.

It is no good watching if nobody is going to do anything about it — in fact, there is no point in having a watchman at all. Yet he is there to play his part in saving his people, and so must any Government of this country and our friends keep alert night and day to save our people and prevent the enemy from trying to use these ghastly weapons on us. You can give up your own life if it seems to you to be right, but you cannot give up the lives of your sheep, and if a Government neglects the necessity of defending those sheep, when even one of those appalling bombs lands on us, millions of people will die cursing that Government — yes, even some of those who worked and spoke for unilateral disarmament will curse when reality hits them. If we say we will wait till they drop the bomb and tie our hands in that way, it is an open invitation to them, like letting Goliath have the first go with his spear and then if David survives he can use his little sling afterwards.

The Government must watch and be ready with its deterrent to save its people, and we must pray, all of us, that this terrible thing will never happen in our lifetime, nor in that of our children, nor in that of our grandchildren — and I have 11 lovely ones of those. But we too must all work in that garden of endeavour and play our part to defend our people, watch and pray — most of us do not pray nearly enough — and we should pray especially for the rechristianisation of Russia. I was delighted to hear the Bishop of London remind us that we should pray. There is too little of the power of prayer in all the documents that have been sent to us. Unilateral disarmament is to tempt the Devil, who has never shown himself willing to resist temptation; but with multilateral disarmament, painstakingly negotiated, and with trust in God that, having played our part, negotiating like a faithful steward where we can, being both watchful and prayerful, then God too will play his part, if we call upon him, and save his people.

The Archbishop of Canterbury: In the course of this debate on nuclear weapons and Christian conscience, a large area of ground common to all Christians has already been mapped out. Full-scale nuclear war would be incalculably disastrous for our world. It may be possible to enter a just war in which gains will be in proportion to inevitable damage, but there

can be no such thing as just mutual obliteration.

Christians can never have an easy conscience about nuclear weapons. We must interpret the signs we have seen correctly. The cloud on the cover of the report represents the outcome of man's attempt over hundreds of years to manage to dominate his environment and to impose himself upon nature and his fellows. Ironically, the effort to achieve mastery has brought us to a point where we have unbound unmanageable forces. The cloud is a judgment on centuries of aggressive intention.

In such a dangerous situation, the Church, in particular, has a responsibility to speak with great care. That means at least an assault on hygienic words which promote complacency and on the propaganda and distortion which increase hostility between the peoples of the world. Action on these two fronts can change the climate in which decisions are made. Respect for the word, intellectual, moral and spiritual, is the first step in maturity, said Dag Hammarskjöld.

The Working Party's report is exemplary in this respect. I would like to add my voice to the tributes already paid to the Bishop of Salisbury and his team. They have not fudged the truth that when we are talking of a world in which so much human talent and so many scarce natural resources are being wasted in the production of weapons of mass destruction, we are talking about a world that is in the grip of madness.

So far I would be surprised if there was very much disagreement among us. But now we come to the crucial question, sharply posed by the Bishop of Salisbury's amendment. How do we get from where we all know we are to where we all want to be? We cannot disinvent nuclear weapons and they are a clear sign that we live in a world which is in rebellion against its own best interests — a world which has rejected the order given to it by its Creator. How do Christians fulfil their vocation and prime moral duty to be peace-makers in such a world?

I regret to say that I do not find the recommendations contained in *The Church and the Bomb* and further amplified in the Bishop of Salisbury's amendment to be entirely coherent or convincing. I do not believe that unilateral measures of the kind suggested will in fact have the effect 'of getting multilateral reductions moving'.

Now we are all seeking to achieve arms reductions and to stabilise the balance of terror at a lower level of armament on both sides. This must be done in negotiations, as section (c) of the amendment suggests, but my fear is that the kind of action being advocated will actually un-

dermine the negotiations now in progress in Geneva.

There are good reasons for believing that, faced with mounting internal economic and social difficulties, the leaders of the Soviet Union are seriously committed to the success of the present round of negotiation. It would be a tragedy if the Soviet will to make progress, for example in eliminating the most threatening weapons in Europe, were to be weakened by the spectacle of the NATO alliance in disarray and the tempting prospect of gaining great diplomatic advantage by consolidating a nuclear as well as a conventional superiority in Europe.

Too often this country has appeared to send misleading signals to those who have been tempted to pursue aggression. Make no mistake, an announcement of the 'United Kingdom's intention of carrying out, in consultation with its allies, a phased disengagement of the United Kingdom from active association with any form of nuclear weaponry' would have a traumatic effect on the NATO alliance. I have seen very little evidence that those responsible for policy in other NATO countries would regard renunciation of nuclear weapons as anything other than a repudiation of the cornerstone of NATO's defence policy. On the contrary, I have heard much to suggest that such a step would put a new strain on the alliance on which the peace and stability of Europe has rested since World War II, by strengthening the advocates of isolationism in the United States.

My worries about this are not just on grounds of prudence and credibility. The basis of alliances is a willingness to share responsibilities. Is there not some moral inconsistency in seeking to remain within an alliance which accepts a policy of nuclear deterrence while declining to take one's share in the means by which that policy is sustained?

Another understandable, but I fear forlorn, hope expressed both in the report and in the Bishop of Salisbury's amendment, is that Britain's gesture might have an exemplary effect and do something to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The report says that the United Kingdom should renounce its independent deterrent 'in the hope of putting new life into the Non-Proliferation Treaty'. In fact, there are now 119 parties to the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty, which is the largest number of countries adhering to any current international agreement. The principal non-signatories of the Treaty are concerned much more about regional situations (Argentina and Brazil or India and Pakistan) than they are about the general attitude of the nuclear powers. It is most improbable that a unilateral gesture by the United Kingdom would bring in any new signatory. Recent experience suggests that no

country wishes to incur the international odium of flouting the Non-Proliferation Treaty by openly declaring itself a new nuclear weapon State. India, for example, when it exploded a nuclear device, maintained it was for peaceful purposes only and that country has been very careful to uphold this position and has thereby demonstrated that the Non-Proliferation Treaty does have some bite.

Since I believe that the unilateralist approach would undermine disarmament negotiations in progress without exerting much exemplary influence, I cannot accept unilateralism as the best expression of a Christian's prime moral duty to be a peace-maker.

I emphatically believe, however, that we cannot be satisfied with the present *status quo*. There is a deep-felt longing in Western Europe to see results from the negotiations which are now taking place in Geneva, and a feeling of urgency about the need to reduce the level of nuclear armaments on both sides. That is natural and right, and I would associate myself with the conviction expressed by the Pope that 'in current conditions "deterrence" based on balance' may still be judged morally acceptable 'certainly not as an end in itself but as a step on the way toward a progressive disarmament'.

This is a moment to seek not only to stabilise the balance of terror, but to gain fresh determination to build more effective international institutions to ensure common security. I am not thinking so much of world government as of a new world order. I think that we should be paying more attention to the plea contained in the first report, issued last September, of the new Secretary-General of the United Nations, Senor Perez de Cuellar. He described what he called 'the new international anarchy' and listed some steps which Governments ought urgently to consider: greater use of the United Nations mediation facilities; more immediate resort to the Security Council and the building up of the United Nations' policing capability. The Secretary-General is talking about the provision of arrangements for the world which are possessed by the humblest local authority — an ambulance, a fire brigade, a police force.

There is nothing new in the concept, of course. But it is strange that the subject is so neglected in comparison with disarmament.

A new world order is not, of course, only a matter of a more efficient police force. We should not forget the contention of the Brandt Commission that the denial of justice to the hungry and poor in the world

will have more and more explosive consequences from which none of us will be entirely insulated.

There are, however, so many barriers to our sympathy and compassion; so many stereotypes of one another that make talk of brotherhood merely theoretical. The Pope's New Year message emphasises the importance of a commitment to 'dialogue' as a way of reducing the dangerous misunderstandings and tensions generated by our ignorance and contempt for one another. I have had long experience of theological conversations with Russian churchmen; I have many personal friendships with ordinary people in the Soviet Union, and as a consequence I have come to glimpse the differences between our mental furniture and basic categories of thought. It seems worse than ironic that we are running down Russian studies in our schools and universities just at a time when we are increasing our defence spending.

But peace is not just something for high-powered dialogue or international commissions. We have to acknowledge that the springs of violence and war are in everybody. This is implied in the UNESCO constitution 'since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed'.

To embark on this involves a profound and costly personal repentance and sometimes even peace groups, who have done so much to dent our complacency, can manifest the kind of unrepentant and unreflective aggression they so readily ascribe to others.

Someone said to me about this debate, 'Well, of course, Archbishop, it is really a debate between faith and principle on the unilateralist side and pragmatism on the side of the multilateralists.' I do not believe that that is true. I do not impugn the honesty or good faith of those who support unilateralism, but I believe there is also moral seriousness in the multilateral approach. It is a prime moral responsibility, I repeat, of a Christian, it is the strategy which Our Lord commended, to build peace in an immoral world. The way of negotiations and building new international institutions also demands moral courage and perseverance.

Principle is not the exclusive possession of those who are attracted to larger gestures. Our Church takes pride in the achievements of Wilberforce and Shaftesbury who in the last century helped to bring to an end the slave trade and the brutalising of children. We sometimes forget that their vision had to be translated into relentless pegging away at detailed facts. Principle also belongs to those whose moral sense expresses itself in the painstaking precision and care about detail which I

have found among some of those actually involved in disarmament negotiations. I hope that this Synod will be united in signalling to them our understanding, our respect and our support.

Canon A.C. Hall (Manchester): It is always an unenviable thing to follow the Archbishop of Canterbury, but I do so with a little bit of encouragement from one lead which he gave me. For 37 years Western Europe has been spared armed conflict through nuclear deterrents, and we can perhaps thank God for that; but that is not to say that the world has enjoyed peace, and there is no guarantee that the deterrent will continue to work in spite of the spiralling cost. We cannot argue from the past to the future, and, as the Brandt Report said, the world as a result is not made safer, only poorer.

Who in fact pays the cost of this so-called peace? The cost is paid by men and women, Soviet, American, British and virtually every nationality in the world. The economy of every country is distorted by its expenditure on arms, 650,000 million dollars last year, the equivalent of the total income of one and a half million people living in the 50 poorest countries of the world, more than one-third of the world's peoples' income. Who actually benefits? Whose pocket does that money actually go into? Those highly skilled and highly paid scientists, technicians, production workers and salesmen who have, alas, therefore a vested interest in the continuing production of ever more sophisticated weapons. Alas, the military/industrial complex wants to keep up the tension between nations to maintain lucrative jobs, lucrative profits, and lucrative bribes.

Now, all this expenditure is sought to be justified by those who want to justify it as being in order to contain Marxist ambitions. But look at the map of the world. Since 1945 Angola, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Vietnam, Yemen, and some would add Zimbabwe, all, like nations behind the Iron Curtain, ruled by left-inclined regimes. Why? Because the West backed with arms reactionary regimes against the legitimate demands of their people for basic human needs and human rights. If the West had used even part of its defence budgets to meet those needs, the advance of Marxism could have been stemmed. El Salvador and Namibia could go the same way. The Archdeacon of Ovamboland said to us, 'If Christian countries will not help us, you leave us no choice but to accept help from the East'. And it is not beyond the realms of possibility that this country too is not immune from Marxist take-over. The unemployed in this country outnumber the police and the armed forces six to one.

We think that by our nuclear deterrents we are saving the whole world, but in the process we are losing its soul. Britain has a God-given opportunity which this Synod has the opportunity today to articulate to reverse the spiral. Our 38 megatons, dare I say it, make little difference to the massive, precarious 4,000 megaton balance between the great powers. We are in a position to divert our expenditure to create real jobs and to provide real overseas aid. For the cost of Trident, every person in the world could have access to pure water. One penny out of every pound which we spend on weapons could provide pure water for the whole world, and while we pray for those inconvenienced by the water workers' strike, people are walking miles for water which is still contaminated, and if we gave every person in the world pure water, we would prevent 80 per cent of all disease.

The criteria of a Just War outlaws the indiscriminate killing of non-combatants; yet even the maintenance of peace today means that people die every second for lack of adequate food and clean water. We may prefer to die on our feet rather than to live on our knees. We have the luxury of making that choice, but the choice that we make and the way we make it, and the cost we incur in doing it, condemns thousands to grinding poverty in this country and in countries the world over.

Mr J.S. Gummer (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): I believe that the saddest thing that has been said in this whole debate is the way in which the media have suggested that in some way the Church ought not to be discussing this matter; for if ever there were a matter which we ought to discuss, it is this, and if ever there were a matter on which we have something special to say, it is this. I am also saddened by the view put in some of the press that people will come to the Synod to tell it what to do. I have come to share something, and I want to share it in the spirit of what the Archbishop of Canterbury said, which was that those of us who have come to a multilateral conclusion have done so, and do so all the time, within the most difficult and stretching moral arguments. I have not come to my conclusion some time ago and not thought about it again; I think about it all the time — and I thought about it particularly in reading *The Church and the Bomb* — for this is not something that one can just agree upon and then hang it on the shelf and think that one has made up one's mind about the subject. It is something which constantly challenges anyone, particularly those of us who have particular responsibilities in making political decisions.

But I have to say that *The Church and the Bomb* did miss the opportunity to discuss the one case in which we have seen what happened when we took a unilateral decision and what happened when we took a

multilateral decision about weapons which are, at least arguably, as terrible, as horrific and, if I may quote the words of the Provost of Southwark, which are genetically and environmentally damaging. Those are biological and chemical weapons. I am sad that the report did not point out that we did in Britain take a unilateral decision about chemical weapons. We got rid of our stocks, we have none, and the United States of America, under President Nixon, did exactly the same thing. The Soviet Union now has the largest stock of chemical weapons that any nation in the history of the world has gathered together. It has, certainly arguably, used them directly in Afghanistan. We know that the Vietnamese, with their yellow rain, have used chemical weapons in Cambodia, or Kampuchea, and probably in Laos. Our unilateral decision — which we managed to convince the whole of West of — has resulted in the further stockpiling and use of chemical weapons by the Soviet Union.

But if we turn to biological weapons, Britain took a multilateral view. We decided to keep the biological weapons which we had, and which the West had, and work for multilateral disarmament of these weapons which most of us would say are now of such capability that the effect of germ warfare is one which would destroy the world more certainly, more devastatingly and more permanently than a nuclear war, and certainly must be thought of in the same terms. We now have world multilateral biological disarmament, mutual, balanced and verifiable. And that was not done by NATO or America; it was done by Britain. Now, we actually led the way, we actually took the responsibility of continuing to hold those weapons, morally reprehensible though they are, until we could rid the world of them. I believe that Christians have got to face the reality of today's world and what example we can at least find, and that is an example which is so important that it ought to have formed part of the reasoning behind *The Church and the Bomb*.

But in any case we are talking about effective disarmament, and I must take direct issue with the words of the Bishop of Salisbury. I do believe that the technicalities are of enormous importance, but it really is not correct to suggest that the motion that he is putting as an amendment does what he says he hopes it will. For its first part suggests that we should rid ourselves of the Polaris strategic nuclear system and cancel its replacement, Trident. He said that just after he had pointed to the particular danger of very accurate weapons. The SS-20's, the Pershings and the Cruise missiles come into that category, although not all in the same way. Yet the one thing which means that the pre-emptive strike cannot be an option is the fact that deep in the oceans of the world are submarines for which that pre-emptive strike is not a possibility. And yet the very first part of the amendment suggests that we rid ourselves of the

specific deterrent which makes even a pre-emptive intermediate nuclear strike an impossibility for a nation which believes that war is for the purpose of victory.

So of course we must not be asking for parity; we must be asking for credibility. The deterrent can only be effective if it is believed in. If the Bishop of Salisbury takes Britain out of the world debate — for that is what he does — if we are not part of the group of nations seeking to draw to the negotiating table not just ourselves but the Soviet Union, then what he is doing is taking from this country the opportunity which we had and used with biological weapons, and the more frightened we are about the effect of SS-20's and of Pershing and of Cruise, the more we ought to be determined to make it worth while the Russians removing them instead of adding to them once a fortnight, every fortnight, pointing towards this country, by saying, as we have said, 'We will deploy no Cruise, we will deploy no Pershing, if you will deploy no SS-10's, SS-20's, or back-fire bombers.'

As Christians we have to face very clearly that the moral responsibility which we have is to work for disarmament of the whole world and of all these weapons, and we of all people must not be put off by those who say that is too great an aim, that we cannot do that and therefore let us settle for something else, because the thing that we must do is too big for Christians to attempt. It is because I feel deeply that Christians of all people must attempt the impossible that I pray that today we will press once again upon this Government and upon NATO and upon the Warsaw Pact countries the prime responsibility for multilateral disarmament. Ten million people have died in conventional war since 1945. The deterrent has saved the peace only in one part of the world, but it is no argument for Canon Hall to suggest putting that peace in peril merely because there has been war elsewhere. I believe that it would be quite wrong to leave the Soviet Union as the sole possessor of the nuclear weapon. I believe that it would be quite wrong for Britain to leave the initiatives in western disarmament only to the United States of America and to the isolationist pressures and the appalling attitudes which one sometimes hears. I believe that it is the Christian witness to say honestly that we wish this world was not the world that it is, we pray that it changes, but while it is what it is, we have to be prepared to work at that point where the danger is greatest to ensure the security of all people.

(Adjournment)

THE CHAIR

The Bishop of Liverpool took the Chair at 2.30 p.m.

THE CHURCH AND THE BOMB

(Resumed Debate)

The Chairman: We started this morning with prayers; I suggest we should simply be silent for a minute or so now in the middle of our debate.

The Dean of Bristol (Very Rev. A.H. Dammers): The circumstance that I am called to speak immediately after lunch when my colleague the Dean of Durham was called to speak at the beginning of the debate recalls to me the observation made by the actress Miss Elinor Glyn, who observed when confronted with the annual deans and provosts conference that we constituted a forest of deans.

I would like to make two points. The first is my conviction, which I have held for some months now, that the real debate is not between the unilateralists and the multilateralists; it is between those who are committed to nuclear disarmament as a means to international peace and those who are not so committed. For, of course, unilateralists want other nations to disarm as well as their own, and multilateralists certainly realise that their own nation must disarm if others are to do the same. So the big question is this: is there a common policy that could unite the multilateralists and the unilateralists? I believe that there is, and that it demands the attention of this Synod.

Let us suppose that Her Majesty's Government, after consulting our allies, were to offer to the Soviet Union the phasing out of our nuclear weapons and the designation of the United Kingdom as a nuclear-weapon-free zone in return for a comparable reduction of Soviet weapons and the establishment of a comparable nuclear-free zone in Eastern Europe. If such bilateral negotiations were successful, then both unilateralists and multilateralists would have equally achieved their aims. I believe that the Soviet Union would respond to such an offer. According to the *Church Times*, the leader of the recent delegation of churchmen from the Soviet Union said, 'The unilateral disarmament of Great Britain would in fact be bilateral as the Soviet Union is willing to dispose of the same number of rockets and nuclear warheads as Great Britain'. That is only a general statement, but he could hardly have made so significant a political statement without some authorisation. For the United States also such bilateral negotiations could secure a substantial reduction in Soviet weapons while leaving the American armoury intact.

The French in their present mood would hardly object to becoming the only nuclear power in Western Europe. Nor could our NATO allies complain if we relinquished a heavy burden which they have not themselves been able to undertake.

Within our own country, such a bilateral approach to nuclear disarmament might well unite the Labour Party. It could provide a means for the SDP/Liberal alliance of breaking the mould not only of national but of international politics. As for the Conservatives, the adoption of such a policy would once and for all disarm all those critics who, unjustly as I believe, cast doubt on the seriousness of their multilateralist intentions. Indeed, in many ways — and I am not a Conservative — I would rather that they would undertake this task. Under the present Prime Minister they would probably drive the harder bargain. Such a policy, if successful, would indeed put the 'Great' back into Great Britain and earn us the undying gratitude of the whole human family. In the late 1940's, 1950's and 1960's, our greatness lay in our more or less peaceable transfer of power to the peoples of our former empire. In the 1980's and, please God, the 1990's we have an even greater opportunity to take a decisive initiative for peace that could reconcile the aims of the unilateralists and the multilateralists alike.

My second and final point is briefer and more personal. The Working Party refers in a generous paragraph to 'those fellow citizens who fought in 1939-1945 against an evil tyranny and helped to deliver many nations from what would in all probability have been a long period of subjugation to an appalling evil'. As co-president of the newly formed International War Veterans Organisation for Peace, I wish to say that a slowly increasing number of combatants in the Second World War are committing themselves actively and I hope thoughtfully together for peace today. It was the late Earl Mountbatten who, with characteristic briskness, pointed out the total unsuitability of nuclear weapons for defensive purposes, and it was General (later President) Eisenhower who looked for the day when the peoples of the world would rise up to ensure that their Governments are active and tireless in the search for peace.

I realised that that day was coming, or perhaps had even come, at least in the western world though not yet in Eastern Europe, when my elder daughter went on a peace walk to Moscow and when my younger daughter and my wife joined the 30,000 other women at Greenham Common. I realised that that day is at hand. Its coming is a sign of the Kingdom, and this debate takes its place within it.

The Bishop of Birmingham (Rt Rev. H. W. Montefiore): I have listened with attention to today's speeches, in particular those by the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Salisbury. I would like to take this opportunity of saying that I have greatly respected the Bishop of London's handling of business on the Board for Social Responsibility, and I have a particular reason for regretting his impending departure from it. I have worked for many years with the Bishop of Salisbury on the Doctrine Commission, and I hope I may call him my friend. I am not going to try to score points off either of them, but rather to try to put before the Synod in a measured way a third option, which I believe, and hope the Synod will believe, is a more excellent way.

We do indeed find ourselves in apocalyptic times. The combined nuclear armoury of Russia and the USA is now 8 billion tons equivalent of TNT, compared with 12,000 on Hiroshima. There are thousands of nuclear missiles, and plans for more. Never before has this planet been under such threat. This calls, as has been said, for cool minds as well as resolute hearts.

At the same time, let us not forget, as we have been reminded this morning, that 50 million were killed in the last Great War, and 10 million in lesser wars since then. The Falklands war has shown us the increased destructive power of conventional weaponry. *Homo sapiens*, alone among the species on this planet, engages in large-scale destruction of his own kind. For all our noble ideals and ability to do good, original sin is very deeply embedded in the human condition, and no facile liberal solutions are likely to work.

Man is at his most destructive, as Arthur Koestler has pointed out, when ideologies are involved. And these are involved. We in the West, however much we genuinely love the Russian people, regard their system as evil; evil in its persecution of religion and of those who seek the truth, evil in its totalitarian control of communications, production and government. At the same time we must recognise, we need to remind ourselves, as we have not yet reminded ourselves, that Eastern Europe regards the western system as degenerate and dissolute, leading to greed, materialism, injustice and large-scale unemployment. Christianity is not tied to any ideology. We must try to keep the peace.

What can the Church do? Detailed strategies are best left to independent research institutes, strategic experts, and the rest. There would be something ludicrous about a group of self-important churchmen telling the Ministry of Defence how to run its affairs. But the Church does have a vital role — not to engage in sterile arguments between 'doves' and

'hawks', but to open up the real moral issues, to judge moral choices, and to give a creative lead out of our *impasse*.

Where do we get our authority from? I think we need to remind ourselves at this stage that there are no direct answers from the New Testament, because we find there only the ethics of personal action. But the ethics of the State are necessarily different because of deep human sinfulness. No one surely would suggest that the State should always turn the other cheek. We are concerned today not with personal behaviour but with the morality of the State, and Jesus gave us no teaching on that. And because our situation is unprecedented, tradition does not give us a direct answer. For example, the rules of the Just War are concerned with fighting wars and not with deterring aggressors. We must be influenced by Scripture and tradition, but we must seek wisdom wherever it may be found. And also it behoves a body such as this Synod to consider the ethical criteria by which our choices are made; that is to say, the intention of the agent, the nature of the act, and the probable consequences of the action. There is no easy fitting of moral absolutes to circumstances: we must take all three factors into account.

Are we justified in deterrence? Yes, deterrence is a positive duty of the State; as St Paul said, to be a 'terror to evil'. The principle holds from policemen to nuclear weapons. But how can the nuclear deterrent be morally justified? For the deterrent to be credible, we must be prepared to use it; but to use it would be catastrophic and immoral. The objection is formidable but not overwhelming. If it is effective, it will deter, and so never be used. That is the justification. To be determined to use it in response to nuclear attack has, as others have told us, insured us against nuclear aggression, for no one in his senses would engage in mutual assured destruction; and it will continue to be a guarantee for about 10 years, and no longer, for reasons which the Bishop of Salisbury outlined.

If one side lacked the deterrent, this would make nuclear war far more likely, not less likely. The intention behind the deterrent is to keep the peace. The nature of the act is a threat, a threat to do something immoral, the kind of threat which a State has from time to time to make, in the light of human sinfulness and the probable consequences of the action. The most probable consequence is that nuclear peace continues to be kept. Speakers have mentioned Hiroshima: does anyone seriously imagine that a nuclear bomb would have been dropped on Hiroshima if the Japanese had had a nuclear deterrent? Of course not. Hiroshima is what happens if only one side in a major confrontation has the nuclear bomb. Whether these weapons will always be needed is not for me to say. My amendment asks for 'adequate forces', and I do not really know

what that means. Since the making of nuclear bombs is now an open secret and one can even make them in a backyard (an American magazine has published the know-how) it seems to me — but I may be wrong — that the planet will go on needing a nuclear deterrent to the end of time to guard against nuclear blackmail. That is a terrifying thought.

Here I would say a word — a friendly word I hope — about the Bishop of Salisbury's suggestions. I think that Trident Mark 2 is a dreadful waste of money. I am glad there is a peace movement to ginger us up; but I think that the probable consequences of our deciding to phase out USA nuclear weapons stationed in this country is for the USA either to give way to isolationist pressures and pull right out of Europe, which is always a possibility, or — as those who heard Alistair Cooke's 'Letter from America' this week will realise — give further ground to the 'hawks'. And as for the Russians, their only response would be to give a little ground on Mr Andropov's proposals for reduced numbers of SS-20's. But I am concerned with the moral stance involved in the Bishop of Salisbury's proposals. Whatever he intends, he is implying to me this, 'We want to stay in NATO under the umbrella of the USA nuclear shield but we are not going to dirty our hands or endanger our land'. I accept that is not what he intends, but it is what he says to me.

If we keep this deterrent we must make it absolutely clear that it will be used only in defence and never in attack. I fear that is not the case today. I am told that the Russians deploy their forces as much for attack as for defence, and NATO is as interested in tanks as in anti-tank defences. Defensive intentions must be made crystal clear from the type of weapons employed, their tactical deployment, and the battlefield training given to troops. Fortunately modern technological weaponry actually favours defence. The probable consequence of being seen to be purely defensive is that a potential opponent no longer feels threatened and tension is eased.

I turn next to battlefield weapons, which to my great surprise have not been mentioned. NATO's present policy is 'flexible response', a horrible example of newspeak — what the Archbishop of Canterbury would call hygienic words which invite complacency. It means the possible 'first use' of nuclear weapons on the battlefield to prevent Western Europe being overrun by aggressors. That is what our troops are training for. This 'first use' would entail devolving control of nuclear weapons from government level to local commanders on the battlefield, with all that that implies.

I suggest to the Synod that this policy today cannot be morally justified. There are many kinds of nuclear battlefield weapons on offer and indeed in store; nuclear artillery shells, gravity nuclear bombs, nuclear depth charges, nuclear land mines, ground to ground and ground to air missiles, to say nothing of neutron bombs. Our official policy in this country and in NATO is that the threat of first use of these weapons will deter Russia from invading Western Europe, and if it does not do that, their actual use will act as it were like a shot over Russia's bows, so that they will quickly go back again. Russia, however, has said that it will make a massive nuclear response, and this seems to be the most probable consequence of their use. Official strategists say that to forswear first use would encourage Russia to begin conventional warfare, but this is very doubtful. We are already well equipped to meet them, and General Rogers, Commander-in-Chief of NATO, has said that he only needs 1 per cent increased expenditure, over and above the additional 3 per cent which he has been promised, to secure Europe without nuclear battlefield weapons of a range of up to 20 kilometres. Surely the people of NATO would prefer this to the danger of what would almost certainly escalate into all-out nuclear war. Field Marshal Lord Carver, in a recent article in the *Tablet*, has given four reasons why 'no first use' would be advantageous, and four reasons why first use could be disastrous. Kissinger and Macnamara incline towards no first use. This is the position at the moment of the American Roman Catholic bishops, and of the American Union of Concerned Scientists. For consider the nature of the act — for us to introduce into the conflict a new and terrible type of weapon, comparable to, say, chemical warfare. The history of war among super-powers shows that a policy of no first use is effective, at least so far as poison gas warfare is concerned.

What about intercontinental and intermediate missiles? I refer here not merely to SS-4's and 5's and 20's, and Cruise and Pershings, but also to those intercontinental missiles hidden deep in their silos in the USA and the Urals. First use of these is usually called in military jargon 'first strike'. Those which take least time to reach their targets, like Pershing 2's, are most dangerous, for they require — in fact they need — only a computerised response. One can see a terrible temptation for a first strike to knock out an opponent's ability to reply, especially, as the Bishop of Salisbury informed us so rightly, since these missiles become more and more accurate.

There can never, I suggest, be a moral justification for first strike. The intention is not defence, but naked aggression in the form of pre-emptive action. The nature of the act is evil. It is deliberately to loose hell on earth. In any case, some nuclear weapons cannot be knocked out in this

way and some cannot be accurately targeted as yet — for example, those in submarines; and so the effect of first strike remains as mutual assured destruction, and will so remain for about a decade, which is about as long as we have got. For all the increasing accuracy of our missiles, it is mutual assured destruction today which is the real deterrent.

So long as we continue to have mutual assured destruction as a result of nuclear missiles in submarines, the peace is kept, apart from accidents and total madness, and there are safeguards against both, though one would wish, of course, that they were better. We do not need parity. We do not need these thousands of missiles. They are an absurdity, an obscenity; but neither side will dismantle theirs until they are assured that the other side will not be an aggressor.

Hence the desperate need for confidence-building measures. The present debate in the country, alas, is polarised on Pershing and Cruise weapons, and on disarmament. But far more important than the number and type of weapons is what we intend to do with them. As for the United Kingdom, we possess only 4 per cent of the total nuclear armoury, and I honestly think that gestures by us will not have any impact on the USA or the USSR. What is needed is a solemn assurance, believed in by both sides, given by both sides, that they will never indulge in 'first use' or 'first strike'. This frees everyone at a stroke from nuclear blackmail and nuclear aggression. It is as simple as that. It could be a break-through. If you do not believe me, read what Field Marshal Lord Carver writes about his talks with top Russian nuclear strategists.

Of course there would not be miracles overnight. But the whole atmosphere could change. We would be able to have those real and balanced force reductions for which we all long and for which, I hope, we all pray, and an end to the terrible waste of resources being spent on arms when they should be helping the millions of people of this world who are condemned to starvation or to a minimal existence.

I hope that my words may commend themselves to the Synod. I hope that we may have a consensus of Synod which can give a real moral lead to the nation, and through the nation to the other nuclear powers — we can do nothing on our own — and point the way in our ghastly dilemma to a creative way forward.

Canon J.H. Williams (Chelmsford): I wish to speak about my amendment which is on the Thirteenth Notice Paper. Some members of the Synod may be asking, why another amendment? I am reminded of a speech made by a lady in this Synod last evening in which she reminded

us of a certain alcoholic beverage which she claimed was capable of reaching certain parts which similar beverages had problems in reaching. That, I think, is true of my amendment today so far as this peace debate is concerned. I believe that my amendment is reaching and endeavouring to deal with certain issues which the others before us have not so far reached.

First, I think it has the good point of being brief. Secondly, the amendment does mention God's concern for this world and for peace. This morning and this afternoon we have been expressing very much of our concern for peace, but I think that as Christians it is only right that we should remember that this is God's world and he is so concerned, so much so that he sent his Son into the world to be the Prince of Peace and to go to the Cross to make peace. I am sure too that we need to remind people today that they are unlikely to be able to live in peace with one another unless they first come into a relationship of peace with God through Jesus Christ. Thirdly, my amendment calls for conventional as well as nuclear multilateral disarmament, and, as I shall try to show later, I believe that there is or should be a very close tie-up between the two; and fourthly, my amendment asks for a system of inspection.

What are our aims in this Synod to be? The obvious one is the avoidance of war, but we wish to go further than that and say that we are in favour of peace. Secondly, as has already been mentioned, we wish to stand for the avoidance of nuclear blackmail; but, more than that, we wish to go on and say that we are in favour of freedom. We can thank God for many freedoms which we enjoy in this country and which indeed we have been exercising today: the freedom of speech — we are able in this Synod to say what we like; we can praise our Government or blame it if we so wish; the freedom of the press who are with us to report us or ignore us as they choose. How can these aims be achieved?

I believe that we can only have peace and freedom through a balance of power. We have been reading a great deal of the unilateral case which has been put before us, particularly in the main report, but I believe that there are certain weaknesses in it. First, we have to question the wisdom of our giving away our particular nuclear weapons, because, if we do, of course we give away our bargaining power. If tomorrow we could get rid of all our nuclear weapons in the United Kingdom, of course we could go home and sit in our armchairs and feel a clear conscience and think, 'It is not up to us, it is up to the others'. But as long as we keep them I believe that we have got to engage in talks with other countries, and I believe we have a certain amount of bargaining power. Of course, it is not much because we have not got a large nuclear arsenal, yet we have

something, and I believe we ought to use the power that we have to try to bring peace to the world.

Secondly, I am a little concerned about some of the morality of the report, because it seems that we are being told that it is immoral for us to have nuclear weapons in this country to defend ourselves, but somehow it is all right to shelter under somebody else's nuclear umbrella. I would put it to the Synod that if it is immoral for us to possess nuclear weapons in order to defend ourselves, it is equally immoral for us to shelter under somebody else's nuclear umbrella.

Next, I believe that unilateral disarmament is highly dangerous because if our example were copied just by the other western nations, there would indeed be a nuclear power vacuum. There are many unilateral dangers and many people have seen them. In our own country, Mr James Callaghan has made his views known in the last few months. In Russia President Andropov has described the unilateral approach as naive. Dr Popov has been quoted already this morning, and also, of course, at the beginning of this year, the Pope made his views very clear to us all. But I have also to go on to say that multilateral nuclear disarmament on its own is also something which is highly dangerous, because we have to realise that if it were possible tomorrow to get rid of all nuclear weapons in this world, we would still have a very real problem because of the great imbalance there is in the world so far as conventional weapons are concerned.

Therefore, today it is very important for us as a Synod not only to encourage our own Government and the other nations of the world to reduce progressively their dependence on nuclear weapons, but also to call for a reduction in conventional weapons as well. Surely we do not want the West to rearm in order to get this balance, because the money can and should be spent for much better purposes. We must, I believe, press forward along the lines of conventional disarmament as well as nuclear disarmament.

I go a long way with the Bishop of Birmingham, but I believe that there are certain situations in a conventional war where we would have either to surrender or to use a nuclear weapon. I do not want to see any nuclear weapons used, and I certainly do not want to see our country as the first country to use them, but I believe that in a conventional war we could find ourselves in a very difficult situation. If the USSR can be persuaded to reduce her conventional weapons so that we get somewhere near a balance of power, then I would certainly go along with the Bishop of Birmingham, but I believe that we must stress the need for con-

ventional as well as nuclear disarmament.

Finally, fallen human nature being what it is, I believe also that we must press for an effective system of inspection to allay the fears of secret rearmament on one side or the other. I believe this is absolutely essential. In closing, I think that we ought to remember the words of Christ who did exhort us not only to be harmless as doves but also as wise as serpents.

The Chairman imposed a five-minute time limit on all further speeches on this question.

The Chaplain of the Fleet and Archdeacon of the Royal Navy (Ven. R.H. Roberts): I have very little military erudition, and I would not presume to follow in the same way as the Bishop of Birmingham and some others who know in great and admirable technical detail about the nature of this problem. I would merely say as a naval chaplain that I have knocked around for a number of years among people, and it is for the people which this whole issue concerns that I would like to say one or two words in the five minutes available.

I am delighted that in this debate nobody has tried to make points. It is quite easy in such a debate for us to be polarised, for us to live under labels, to be pacifists or to be warmongers or to be militarists. It is very easy for us to make caricatures out of those whose expressions are different from our own. We have not tried to do that, because this Synod will not. I think that this debate has been marked by that sweet reasonableness of which the preacher spoke at the Eucharist on Monday. That is the way I have seen it described in a quotation for which I am unable to provide the source, but which goes like this:

‘Declared the Quaker to the soldier,
When two such as thee and I meet,
Then thou should rejoice to see my peaceable demeanour,
And I should be grateful for thy strength and ability to protect me in it.’

The Second Vatican Council put it differently but said the same thing: those who are serving their country in the armed forces should regard themselves as servants of the people’s security and liberty. While they are fulfilling this duty, they are genuinely contributing to the establishment of peace.

The relationship of the press with the military in the Falklands campaign

last year was not always an easy one. I had the responsibility of sending 16 Anglican priests to serve with the young people who themselves served in the South Atlantic, and so I was glad to read that a pressman, Brian Hanrahan, afterwards had this to say about the military: 'There were two things going on. One was that in personal terms I was surprised at both the humanity and the intelligence shown by everybody I met. I think I started off with the stereotype that people in the forces are rather odd: that they have a mission to go out and shoot people and that they are really not much more than that. I found that they were very humane, very aware, willing to discuss all-round issues and not to take the military view of them. I think I grew to warm to everybody out there, and I discovered that they are a very bright bunch of people whose opinions are by no means jingoistic and militarist, though they are in a profession which is military.'

I was brought up in the Nonconformist home of a South Wales coal miner. It was not a bad way of learning how to value humanity and awareness and discussion. I was also brought up, having questioned everything and made my decisions, then to join in and not to opt out. That I think is why I am a churchman and why I am a priest.

I am delighted to be associated in the Royal Navy with those who care about peace sufficiently actually to do something about making it and keeping it, and I have learned in the last 25 years that doing so is very costly. Peace does not happen simply because we yearn for it. It has a very direct connection with righteousness and I find myself unable to be submissive in the face of unrighteousness, because not to seek after righteousness is not to seek after God, and where God is denied there can be no possibility of peace.

I am enchanted that there are people in this Synod who believe that if we make romantic gestures the Russian leaders will respond with the charm and honesty of purpose of a bunch of public school prefects. They will not; the ruling clique in the Soviet Union has nothing to do with righteousness. The Russian people, as we have been told, like the British or Americans or any other civilised people, greatly desire to live their lives in peace. The aims of their leaders are otherwise. They are not motivated by a defensive fear of the West; they are motivated by an aggressive will to impose their own way. Why else would an historically isolationist nation with a huge land mass and tremendous economic problems over the last 30 years have built and deployed the kind of world-ranging navy that this country possessed at the height of its imperialistic power? The Russian Navy has nearly 300 submarines deployed around the world today. At the height of the U-boat war the Germans

had 70. The Russians have not designed such a navy simply to defend the coastline of a beleaguered motherland.

I will finish by making one more quotation from a document which has come into my hands published by the Armed Forces Political Directorate in Moscow — not hearsay, but what the Russians say to the Russians. 'Not one commander and not one soldier has the right to forget that religion is a variety of an ideology alien to us and that as before it retards the growth of awareness and culture and the social activeness of people who profess it. It is naive to hope that religious beliefs will die off of themselves and that religion voluntarily will concede its position in the hearts and minds of people. We have to combat it skilfully, scientifically and seriously. There are no trivial matters in atheistic indoctrination. Everything is important. The overcoming of religious prejudice requires special attention. It is a question above all about a struggle against ideas of abstract pacifism and religious humanism, against an unnatural love for enemies, non-resistance to evil and the anti-patriotic spirit of sermons about a heavenly home'.

That I am against. I am against it because it seems to me to deny the Lord Jesus.

Canon P. Oestreicher (Southwark): I am glad I am speaking after the Chaplain to the Fleet. Others have spoken with respect to pacifists; I speak as a pacifist, but I speak as a pacifist who has deep respect for many who serve in the forces. Some were my parishioners and we came to love each other. The quotation that we have just heard gives me a good opening, because here is an attack, a vicious attack, on pacifism from the Soviet establishment, which is precisely what I would expect — a total lack of understanding of the nature of sacrificial love. I have become more and more convinced over the years, and more deeply even during this debate, that in fact it is the apostasy of Christ's Church, his Body, that has partly led us to the point at which we are now.

If through the years of Christian history the servants of the crucified had refused to take up arms against each other and against their fellow men, the world today would not be where it is. A weak, pacifist, suffering Church was able to convert the Roman Empire from its weakness. A speaker today asked for prayers for the conversion of the Russian people. They have suffered, they have been persecuted, and they have died. We ought not to pray for their conversion but they for ours, because under that suffering the spiritual strength of the faith today in the Soviet Union is greater than it is in our own land, and that points to the bankruptcy of the atheist system that cannot triumph over the love of God in its midst.

But our Working Party knew the kind of world in which we live, took power seriously — and if anything too seriously — actually accepted the terms of reference dictated by power, and put its proposals within those terms, rightly or wrongly, and I subscribe to that. That takes from me great compromise, but that is not a dirty word. I have to share the guilt of my fellow human beings and of my fellow Christians, and recognise that even in our blindness there is still some light. Even in a world armed as ours is, where ultimately we would have no mercy on each other, there is still the possibility of redemption. We find it hard in this Synod to agree with each other, and yet we are all invited to the supper of the Lamb, all as redeemed sinners, and there is hope for us. Do we know ourselves well enough to recognise who is Peter, who is John and who is Judas? We might remember that the women went all the way to God with Jesus.

The proposals that the Working Party put up are realistically possible, and yet have within them that spiritual grain of hope. It simply recognises that a small and relatively weak nation like our own can actually do something to break the logjam. It would not be just a little gesture. It would be recognised as something very significant. If it was not so significant, it would not be so strongly opposed. It would be highly significant and yet, strangely, it would not endanger our security even as this world understands security. That to me is not the most important thing, but it would enable us as a nation diplomatically to become really independent yet faithful within our alliance. Japan is a loyal ally of the United States and does not believe it needs nuclear weapons for its security and does not want them. The Japanese are not wild idealists, they have tasted something of what this means. And yet they are part of the world of power.

We have made proposals that are compromise proposals but that are utterly realistic if we are prepared radically to rethink in the way that is probably necessary. The great powers have talked and talked for 20 years of nuclear disarmament and have probably even meant it, but have not trusted each other, and the spiral goes on, and the order books are full beyond the 10 years that the Bishop of Birmingham gives us.

Somewhere an act, yes, perhaps that some people would call foolish, must be taken, but Our Lord said there is a holy foolishness that we can even commend to a secular world for its own sake because we love our Government, not because we hate it, because we love the people on the other side just as much. It is a profound challenge to us and yet in that small hope, because this planet is put into our hands to love — the apocalypse is in God's hands, and his world, our potential enemies and

our own children are in ours — there are things we can do to preserve and to choose life.

The Bishop of Durham (Dr J.S. Habgood): We are near the end of a long debate and most of the major points that could have been made have, I am sure, been made already, and very soon we are going to have to decide what to do and bear in the back of our minds what our decision might actually achieve. It is with that in mind that I want to add a small political footnote to the debate.

I shall put my vote behind the Bishop of Birmingham's amendment because I think it stands the greatest chance of carrying the greatest majority in the Synod. It is an eirenic motion. It stands in the middle. I think it is easy to be swayed by the deep sincerity of someone like Canon Oestreicher and his rhetoric and to feel that as a Christian Synod we ought to do something more dramatic because eirenic motions do not on the whole make headlines, and I acknowledge that the general shift in the climate of opinion in disarmament talks and in the nation as a whole owes an enormous amount to those who have taken extreme positions, not least the authors of the Working Party's report; and this I believe is all to the good.

If negotiations are to be conducted with a sense of urgency there has to be a groundswell of public opinion. What is not so often recognised is that, once the groundswell is moving, to try to take things too far and too fast can have precisely the opposite effect of what is intended. To explain why, I would like to point to what I believe are the three motivations underlying the main agitations on this.

The first one is moral indignation, the second one, I believe, is fear, and the third, I believe, is a sort of gut anti-Americanism. I am not going to say more about moral indignation, because a great deal has been said about this; simply on this point to add that there is a fundamental difference between domestic policy and foreign policy which those who try to push Governments too hard do not always recognise. Pressure groups can change domestic policies because the people doing the pressing are, by and large, those who are going to be affected, but in foreign policy the people who have to be considered are not us but other nations, and a Government which is seen to succumb too easily to public agitation simply loses credibility. What the world would see if Britain took the line advocated by the Bishop of Salisbury would not be a highly moral gesture but yet further evidence of a British decline. I believe it would be helpful if those who agitate for dramatic changes were to show a little more awareness of this kind of paradox, just as it would be

helpful too if the Government would give more indication that the cries of moral indignation are really being heard. It is not good enough simply to think of this as an argument in which one side or the other can win by political rhetoric. Our society would be healthier if there was a genuine sharing of the moral dilemmas and a general sense of the willingness to discuss with one another as has been shown in this Synod.

I have very little time to say anything about fear or anti-Americanism, but that is the penalty of speaking at the end of the debate. I simply want to point out that fear is a dangerous motive in this field because fear tends to lead us towards self-fulfilling prophecies.

Finally, on anti-Americanism, I believe, and I have said it in print, that I think the American dimension in all this is absolutely fundamental. I mention this not because I have time to develop it, but simply to draw attention to a suggestion made by Michael Howard very recently that it is time Europe grew up by taking more responsibility for its own defence, preferably through increasing conventional forces. I believe that a lot of the fears both on the American side of European unreliability and on the British side of what the Americans might do — and Cruise is all part of that — would be relieved if we could move within Europe to a much greater reliance upon our own security.

Mrs N.B.C. Wilkinson (Ely): I refer to the moral lead which the Bishop of Birmingham declares is to be the task of the Church to give to the nation. We had a meeting in our diocese at which General Synod members were invited to listen to the views of any who wished to attend. As often happens on such occasions, I took away with me one comment more memorable than the rest. It was in more or less the following terms: God created a universe in which the manufacture of nuclear weapons was inherently possible from the very beginning. That possibility has now come to pass. It is still God's universe. Can we not learn something from our appalling dilemma? What is God saying to us in this situation as it is now irrespective of what may come to pass in the future? That is the vital topic to which I would like the Synod to address its mind.

The Bishop of Salisbury: I beg to move as an amendment:

'Leave out all words after "HM Government" *and insert:*

"(a) to announce the UK's intention of carrying out, in consultation with its allies, a phased disengagement of the UK from active association with any form of nuclear weaponry, involving:

- (i) bringing to an end the Polaris strategic nuclear system, and cancelling the order for the proposed Trident replacement;
- (ii) discontinuing all nuclear weapons wholly or mainly of British manufacture;
- (iii) negotiating Britain's withdrawal from the manning of nuclear weapons systems manufactured by others;
- (iv) negotiating an end to agreements for the present or future deployment of nuclear weapons systems on British soil;
- (b) to invite other governments to make positive responses to the British initiative by comparable measures either of renunciation or restraint;
- (c) to continue to prosecute vigorously disarmament negotiations of all kinds; and
- (d) to devote resources to positive programmes for the building of peace and the fostering of international confidence along the lines indicated in the remaining Recommendations of *The Church and the Bomb* (namely nos. 2-17 and 21-22).''

The Bishop of London: In yesterday's *Times* Prof. Vincent said there are 'two kinds of disarmament. The first kind makes war less likely, the second makes it more likely. They look alike and grow in the same hedgerow.' He went on to speak of the great difficulty of distinguishing between them. But having considered the arguments and listened to this great debate, I must confess that I fear that the proposals of the Bishop of Salisbury enshrined in this amendment must fall into the latter category. The Bishop of Salisbury has mentioned two fallacies: the idea that deterrence can be maintained in an age of increasing accuracy of nuclear weapons, and the idea that deterrence demands parity in nuclear weapons. I am afraid that he himself has fallen into the trap of fallacious thinking. First, the increasing accuracy of nuclear weapons actually reinforces the effectiveness of deterrence because it makes each other's territory vulnerable; which was recognised in the anti-ballistic missile treaty of 1972. Secondly, there is no possibility of either side acquiring a first strike capability — by which I mean a pre-emptive strike — to take out all the opponent's nuclear weapons. We do not live in that situation.

I would like to remind the Synod that NATO has pledged never to use any of its weapons except in response to attack. I may come back to that point in commenting on the Bishop of Birmingham's amendment.

On the question of parity, of course absolute parity is neither necessary nor possible. There is at the moment approximate parity in terms of

warhead capability between the Soviet Union and the USA, and what we must do is to work for disarmament in such a way that although the level is greatly reduced, that balance is not gravely upset. That is why I support the American proposal, which people very often seem to ignore, in the negotiations to cut strategic ballistic missiles by 50 per cent in the first stage. On intermediate nuclear weapons, there is a wide disparity in favour of the Soviet Union, but we do have the opportunity to remove this by scrapping all the missiles on both sides — the SS-20's, the Cruise and the Pershing II's. This is surely the best outcome for removing the nuclear threat from Europe. But if this is to be done, it demands multilateral negotiations, not a unilateral gesture which could so easily be misunderstood both by our allies and the countries of the Warsaw Pact.

I would like to make three comments about the actual terms of the amendment. First, I would like to say a word about negotiations, and perhaps I may take an illustration from a subject which is more familiar to us on the floor of the Synod, namely, the Pastoral Measure. A parish is rightly upset if the pastoral committee or the bishop announces the intention of uniting it to its neighbour and then says, 'We have now come to you for consultation'. If you are going to have consultation, it has to be genuine, and I do not believe that you can ask the United Kingdom to make a declared intention and then to go and talk to its allies. Consultation with them must at the very least come very early in the process and not when you have declared what you are going to do whatever in fact they may say.

Secondly, on NATO. I am sorry that the Bishop of Salisbury was a bit dismissive of my welcome of NATO and the EEC, but the fact remains that we have actually not fought each other, despite grave differences. That is something to be very thankful for. It grew out of the situation over Berlin. It is, I think, something which we should strengthen and not undermine, and there is no doubt if you read the reports of recent meetings of Ministers of the value which is put upon the British independent nuclear deterrent, even though it only represents a small percentage of the cost. Its significance, I believe, is not to be measured in those terms.

The last point I want to make is this. It is all very well to talk about Japan, but there is always all the difference between giving something up and never having had it. This is politically extremely important. I remember not long ago speaking about the Blasphemy Bill in the House of Lords and I said that for my own part I would have wished there had never been an Act against blasphemy — I think the Lord can look after himself — but since we had one, to get rid of it was to imply that

blasphemy does not matter any more. That is why I opposed the Bill. To give up something is never the same as never to have had it. I believe that for us to take unilateral action as is proposed in this amendment would be very destabilising, it would be a failure to exercise our collective responsibility in terms of NATO. There are many things we can and should do, not least in the battlefield weapons area, but I believe they must be done in consultation with our allies and not after we have in fact made our declared intention. So I ask the Synod to vote against the Bishop of Salisbury's amendment.

Lt-Cdr C.P.N. Wells-Cole (Lincoln): I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and lost, 100 voting for and 338 against.

The Bishop of Birmingham: I beg to move as an amendment:

'Leave out all words after "international situation" and add:

'and (c) that it is not the task of the Church to determine defence strategy but mindful of its duty to give a moral lead to the nation:

- (i) affirms that it is the duty of Her Majesty's Government and her allies to maintain adequate forces to guard against nuclear blackmail and to deter nuclear and non-nuclear aggressors;
- (ii) asserts that the tactics and strategies of this country and her NATO allies should be seen to be unmistakeably defensive in respect of the countries of the Warsaw Pact;
- (iii) judges that even a small-scale first use of nuclear weapons could never be morally justified in view of the high risk that this would lead to full-scale nuclear warfare;
- (iv) believes that there is a moral obligation on all countries (including the members of NATO) publicly to forswear the first use of nuclear weapons in any form;
- (v) bearing in mind that many in Europe live in fear of nuclear catastrophe and that nuclear parity is not essential to deterrence, calls on Her Majesty's Government to take immediate steps in conjunction with her allies to further the principles embodied in this motion so as to reduce progressively NATO's dependence on nuclear weapons and to decrease nuclear arsenals throughout the world''.

The Bishop of London: With much of this amendment I have the very greatest sympathy; for example, the preliminary words under paragraph

(c) and then subparagraphs (i) and (ii), although I think there is a certain obscurity about the meaning of the word 'defensive' in that it is part of the defensive aspect of deterrence that you should have the capacity for attack, though it would never be used except in response. With subparagraph (v) I have no difficulty and it meets the points that I have just made in commenting on the Bishop of Salisbury's amendment, but I do have grave difficulty about subparagraphs (iii) and (iv), with the statement that even a small-scale first use could never be morally justified. I find it very difficult to support that, particularly in view of the developing nature of nuclear weapons which, as one has said, have become more and more accurate. When it comes to subparagraph (iv), I wonder how far this is in fact compatible with a view of deterrence. I should like to ask the Bishop of Birmingham what he would actually do in the event of attack by conventional weapons on NATO forces which threatened to overrun them completely. He has not told us what he would do in that event. I do not know.

The Bishop of Birmingham: On a point of personal information. I would remind the Bishop of London that I would not be in charge of the forces of this country, but if I were to give advice to the commander-in-chief, which I would not, I could not advise him first use of a new type of dreadful weapon.

The Bishop of London: I am very grateful for that response of the Bishop of Birmingham, because it indicates quite clearly where he stands. I would just remind the Synod that we are speaking now to those who will in fact have the responsibility of making that decision. It may be a hypothetical situation for us, but it is not hypothetical for them. But I feel that if you are going to have any form of deterrence, then you cannot in advance say you will not use it. NATO has already said it will not use nuclear weapons as first use except in response to an attack. That I believe is morally as far as we have a right to go. I know that all members do not share that; I can only say what my own judgment is, although I do know it to be shared by members of the Board, though not all, as is evident from the Bishop of Birmingham's amendment.

I would ask the Synod to think very seriously about the effect of saying what is proposed in subparagraph (iv) of this amendment. I believe it would have an effect on the stability of our present situation which in fact is much greater than the Bishop of Birmingham would suppose. So although I would very much like to accept subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (v) — and if this amendment is defeated and the Bishop of Birmingham sought to add them into the Board's motion, I would not object — I cannot advise the Synod, particularly in view of the general tenor of the debate today, to accept subparagraphs (iii) and (iv).

Lt-Cdr C.P.N. Wells-Cole: I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

This motion was put and carried.

A Member: On a point of order. Would it be possible for the Synod to vote on each paragraph separately?

The Chairman: With the general consent of the Synod it is possible for me to divide any motion or amendment in such manner as to enable the Synod to express its judgment separately upon each part of the motion or amendment so divided; but first I give the mover of the amendment an opportunity to object, if he does, to such a division.

The Bishop of Birmingham: I greatly appreciate the opportunity to comment. I am not willing to have the amendment divided.

The Chairman: Does the Synod give its general consent, which means by a large majority, for the text of the amendment to be divided? . . . The Synod clearly does not.

The amendment was put and The Chairman ordered a division of the whole Synod, with the following result:

Ayes, 275; Noes, 222

The amendment was therefore carried.

The Chairman: The debate on the motion as amended continues, but first I call the Archdeacon of West Ham, Chairman of the Business Sub-Committee.

The Archdeacon of West Ham: The Business Sub-Committee would like to propose a variation in the order of business to extend this debate until not later than 4.45 p.m., but I would like to use this opportunity to appeal to members to consider whether, now that the substantive business has been dealt with, we could get through the remainder of this item as quickly as possible. I would even appeal to some would-be amenders of the next motion, which basically proposes to send the report to dioceses and deaneries, to consider whether they need move their amendments. They have their rights, which I do not wish to deny them, but I hope that the Synod will assist in this matter, because the following item on the Agenda is cable television. Certain decisions may be taken on this or there may be parliamentary debates on it before we meet in July, and I am anxious that we should not cut too much into that debate. Under

Standing Order 5 (a) (i), the variation which I am proposing requires your consent, Mr Chairman, and the general consent of the Synod.

The Chairman: It has my consent. Does the Synod agree?
(Agreed.)

Mr J.D. Walker (Exeter): I beg to move:
‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of London, in reply: We have had today a most excellent debate of the highest quality. There are a number of points on which I would be tempted to comment, but I think the proper and responsible thing to do is for me to say no more than to thank the Synod and those who have spoken for the splendid way in which this very important matter has been dealt with by the Synod.

The Rev. M.J. Saward: On a point of order. Amendments nos. 35,36 and 46 have all fallen, but amendment no. 58 has not been taken, and refers to a part of the main motion before the incorporation of the Bishop of Birmingham’s amendment.

The Chairman: The closure on the motion as amended has been accepted, and I must now put the motion as amended to the Synod.

The motion as amended was put and carried. 387 voting for, 49 voting against, and 29 abstaining, in the following form:

‘That this Synod recognising —

- (a) the urgency of the task of making and preserving peace;
- and (b) the extreme seriousness of the threat made to the world by contemporary nuclear weapons and the dangers in the present international situation:
- and (c) that it is not the task of the Church to determine defence strategy but rather to give a moral lead to the nation:
 - (i) affirms that it is the duty of Her Majesty’s Government and her allies to maintain adequate forces to guard against nuclear blackmail and to deter nuclear and non-nuclear aggressors;
 - (ii) asserts that the tactics and strategies of this country and her NATO allies should be seen to be unmistakeably defensive in respect of the countries of the Warsaw Pact;

- (iii) judges that even a small-scale first use of nuclear weapons could never be morally justified in view of the high risk that this would lead to full-scale nuclear warfare;
- (iv) believes that there is a moral obligation on all countries (including the members of NATO) publicly to forswear the first use of nuclear weapons in any form;
- (v) bearing in mind that many in Europe live in fear of nuclear catastrophe and that nuclear parity is not essential to deterrence, calls on Her Majesty's Government to take immediate steps in conjunction with her allies to further the principles embodied in this motion so as to reduce progressively NATO's dependence on nuclear weapons and to decrease nuclear arsenals throughout the world.'

The Bishop of London: I beg to move:

'That this Synod believes that indiscriminate mass destruction in war cannot be justified in the light of Christian teaching and calls upon the dioceses to study the issues raised in the report *The Church and the Bomb*, and in particular the theological and moral issues, so as to enable Christian people to make a more informed and committed contribution to the making and preserving of peace and to the search for ways of resolving conflicts other than by war.'

I am in some difficulty over this motion, not in regard to its terms, but simply in this respect: I would not wish in any way to minimise the importance of the issues which we have been discussing today being considered at every level of the Church, and indeed one of the things which the Working Party's report has done is to bring this issue fairly and squarely before every Christian community in our Church; and at the same time I do not wish to take the time of the Synod in elaborating on that necessity. I am quite certain that members of the Synod fully support what I have just said and will themselves do all they can to encourage the debate in the light of our own debate in this Synod. So I hope the Synod will forgive me if I say very little more, except for two points.

First, the motion speaks of our responsibility for making 'a more informed and committed contribution to the making and preserving of peace'. That I believe must be our overwhelming consideration, and I believe that, though there are differences among us, as has been clearly indicated today, as to the way in which this is to be achieved, Christians should set an example to the nation in getting together and discussing among themselves how those differences can be resolved and how

together we can give a fresh impetus to the negotiations for peace which are so urgently needed.

Secondly, the motion speaks of 'the search for ways of resolving conflicts other than by war'. Here in a fallen world conflict is something which we have to face day by day. What is needed is the will of the nation, constantly strengthened by the sharp pressure for peace, that conflicts within our national life should be resolved other than by war, whether it be military or any other form of war. If we really mean what we say here, and if we mean what we say about the unity of human life, then it means that our concern for peace today has got to be translated into action, beginning at the level of our own daily life, our life where we work, our life in our leisure. We have got there to set the example of being peace-makers.

So I believe it is not just a question of sending these issues back to the parishes and saying 'Please discuss *The Church and the Bomb*', and so on. It is much more than that. It is trying to increase the whole commitment of our Church to the resolution of conflict by peaceful ways through dialogue, through listening, through thinking, through our openness and being willing to listen to others. That is at the heart of peace. It is no good our calling for peace between nations if we ourselves are not doing all we can to encourage it at our own personal level.

The Dean of Durham: On a point of order. This motion (item 16) refers to the report *The Church and the Bomb*. Would you rule whether this means the report of the Board for Social Responsibility or the report of the Working Party?

The Chairman: When the Bishop of London introduced the debate on the first motion this morning, he said that strictly it was the report of the Board with the report of the Working Party as an appendix and that in fact we were referring to both. I am sure that is the understanding we have had throughout the debate. We are referring to both.

May I say something about the present motion moved by the Bishop of London. I will impose a five-minute limit on speeches. I draw attention to the Thirteenth Notice Paper, page 7, where under item 16 (this motion) the first words are 'If item 15 is carried as amended by item 34'. It was not. It was amended by item 55. So item 37 falls. I do not know whether Dr Lethbridge, Mr Green and Mr Chandler want to move their amendments.

Dr J. W. Lethbridge (Chester): In the light of the point just made and on

the understanding that the report we are actually commending to the dioceses is the Board's report with the appendix *The Church and the Bomb*, I would be happy not to move my amendment.

The Rev. R.C.W. Green (Southwark): I wish to move my amendment, but will do so without comment. I beg to move as an amendment:

'In line 3 after "to study" insert "and pray about".'

The Bishop of London: I would gladly accept that and welcome, as always, any incentive to pray.

The amendment was put and carried.

Mr M. Chandler (Birmingham): I beg to move as an amendment:

'In line 4 after "*Bomb*" insert: "and in the report *Defence and Disarmament* (GS 414)".'

The document to which I refer, GS 414, is *Christians in a Violent World — Defence and Disarmament*. It is a document that came before the Synod in July, 1979, and again in February, 1980. It formed the basis of the report *The Church and the Bomb*. Its recommendations are still substantially valid, and indeed the Archbishop of Canterbury in his speech this morning commended some of the recommendations. I would suggest that the recommendations in *The Church and the Bomb* and the recommendations in GS 414. *Christians in a Violent World*, give a balanced set of documents to put before the dioceses, and with those brief comments I commend the amendment to the Synod.

The Bishop of London: I have great sympathy with Mr Chandler's amendment, but I am afraid I must resist it. There is a very great deal of real value in this document and I actually do not think it got the credit which it deserves. There is much concrete material in it. Of course it is somewhat out of date in some respects, but that is not my main point. I would hope that people will still read it and use it. But I must resist an amendment which includes in this motion a report which has not been debated by this Synod, and simply on that principle I feel I must resist it, although, as has happened up to now, certainly when we are asked for material and so on that report is among that which we advise people to use; but on principle I do not think the Synod can include a reference in that way to a report which this Synod has not debated. I ask the Synod not to accept the amendment.

The amendment was put and lost.

The motion as amended was put and carried in the following form:

‘That this Synod believes that indiscriminate mass destruction in war cannot be justified in the light of Christian teaching and calls upon the dioceses to study and pray about the issues raised in the report *The Church and the Bomb*, and in particular the theological and moral issues, so as to enable Christian people to make a more informed and committed contribution to the making and preserving of peace and to the search for ways of resolving conflicts other than by war.’

Mr C.P. Williamson (Rochester): On a point of order. I believe it would be right, even if out of order, to thank you, Mr Chairman, and ask you to convey the thanks of the Synod to those who have been handling the problems of hospitality and quite unobtrusive security on our behalf today.

The Chairman: Thank you very much. I will make sure those thanks are passed on. There is one further thing I would like to say from the Chair. I think I am right in saying this will have been the last Synod debate which the Bishop of London will have led as Chairman of the Board for Social Responsibility, and I believe the Synod would want to express its appreciation to him for his chairmanship of the Board over the many different items the Synod has asked the Board for Social Responsibility to attend to. I think this has been over a period of some seven years. The Synod is extremely grateful to him, and I am sure you would like to express your thanks.

WESTCOTT HOUSE
THE CHASE
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE

WESTCOTT HOUSE
THE CHASE
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE



cio C I O PUBLISHING
PRICE £1.50